THE APOCALYPSE OF PAUL FROM NAG HAMMADI CODEX V
A TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

By
WILLIAM R. MURDOCK

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

June, 1968

This dissertation, written by

WILLIAM MURDOCK

under the direction of his *Faculty Committee, and approved by its members, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

Faculty Committee

James M Robinson
Chairman

Hans Dieter Betz

Wm H. Brownlee

Date JUNE 1968

F. Thomas Trotter
Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION 1

II. ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE DEAD IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. 21

III. THE JUDGMENT AND PUNISHMENT OF SOULS 75

IV. THE EPIPHANY 125

V. THE INTERROGATION SCENE AND THE PURPOSE OF THE ASCENSION. 168

VI. THE APOCALYPSE AND THE GNOSTIC VIEW OF PAUL. 214

CONCLUSION 236

BIBLIOGRAPHY 242

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION

Introduction

Sometime between 1945 and 1946 a group of fellahin discovered a cache of papyrus codices buried in an urn in the vicinity of Nag Hammadi, some sixty or so miles north of Luxor in Upper Egypt, near the site of the ancient village of Chenoboskion where Pachomius established his monastic community around A.D. 320.[1] Thirteen codices in all have come to light containing a total of fifty-one[2] tractates written in the Coptic language and comprising a veritable library of Gnostic literature.[3] With this mass of new source material, practically doubling the extant

---

[1] On the discovery, see Jean Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, trans. Philip Mairet (New York: The Viking Press, 1960), pp. 116-36; W. C. Van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Heinrich Scheffler, 1960), pp. 9-26.

[2] According to the inventory of Martin Krause, "Der koptische Handschriftenfund bei Nag Hammadi: Umfang und Inhalt," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo*, XVIII (1962), pp. 121-32.

[3] For a survey of the contents of the various documents, see Doresse, pp. 146-248; Henri-Charles Puech, "Les nouveaux Écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (Premier inventaire et essai d'identification)," *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Boston: The Byzantine Institute, 1950), pp. 91-143; Puech, "Découverte d'une bibliothèque gnostique en Haute-Égypte," *Encyclopédie Francaise, fasc.* 19.42, 4-13.

Gnostic literature, the scholarly investigation into the origins of Gnosticism and its relationship to early Christianity was obviously enhanced. It was to this investigation that the present work hoped to contribute by undertaking an examination of one of the documents from Nag Hammadi. The document chosen was the Apocalypse of Paul which occurred as the second tractate in Nag Hammadi Codex V,[4] inventory No. 10548 in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo, on pages 17-24= Plexiglass Nos. 11-18.[5] The Coptic text of the Apocalypse of Paul was edited and published in transcription together with a German translation, introduction, and notes by A. Böhlig and P. Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Sonderband, 1963), pp. 15-26.

Up to the present time the little attention which has been devoted to the Apocalypse of Paul has consisted in the main of a brief survey of its contents and a statement with regard to its relationship to other documents ascribed to Paul. Although his analysis of the content and theme was incorrect and misleading, Doresse correctly observed that the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse of Paul was an entirely different document from the previously known fourth century *Visio sancti Pauli* cited by Augustine and Sozomen and discovered by Tischendorf in 1843.[6] With regard to the 'Αναβατικὸν Παύλου mentioned by Epiphanius as current among the Cainites and the Gnostics proper, Puech was inclined to identify it with the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse and to regard it as the literary basis of the Gnostic speculation on the ascension of Paul reported by Hippolytus and Irenaeus.[7] In the inclination to identify the Nag

---

[4] According to the enumeration of the Coptic Museum. This codex was first numbered III by Doresse, p. 142, and then VII by Puech, "Les nouveaux Écrits . . . ," p.106.

[5] Corresponding to number 9 according to Doresse, p. 142, and number 27 according to Puech, "Les nouveaux Écrits . . . ," p. 106.

---

[6] Doresse, p. 237; Puech, "Les Nouveaux Écrits...," pp. 134-35; Böhlig, p. 18. See in particular, the text of the Greek recension together with the English translation of the Syriac version by J. Perkins in C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae* (Leipzig: Herm. Mendelssohn, 1866), pp. 34-69, and the Latin version by M.R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota* ("Texts and Studies," Vol. II.3; Cambridge: University Press, 1893), pp. 1-42. See also the study by Th. Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with Nine Texts*, London: Christophers, 1935). Eng. trans. by M. R. Rhodes, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 525-55. Ger. trans. by H. Duensing in E. Hennecke and W. W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (3rd. ed. rev; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964), II, 536-67; now also in Eng. *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. A.J.B. Higgens, *et*. *al*.; ed. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963).

[7] Epiphanius, *Panarion haer*., 38.2.5 (Holl, pp. 64. 19-65.1). Puech, "Les Nouveaux Écrits...," pp. 135-36.

Hammadi Apocalypse with the *Anabatikon*, Puech has been followed by Böhlig and Rudolph.[8] Against this identification, however, Doresse had already pointed out that according to Epiphanius the *Anabatikon* dealt with Paul's ascension to the third heaven whereas the Apocalypse described his ascent to the tenth heaven.[9] Even more important, according to Epiphanius the *Anabatikon* was purported to contain the "inexpressible things" (II Cor. 12.4) which Paul heard in the third heaven: καὶ ταῦτα, φασίν, ἐστὶ τὰ ἄρρητα ῥήματα .[10] If the credibility of Epiphanius can be trusted here, the identity of the two documents cannot be affirmed since the "inexpressible things" which according to II Cor. 12.2-4 Paul saw and heard in the third heaven were pointedly avoided in the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse.[11]

With regard to the background of the Apocalypse in the history of religions, Böhlig observed: "Es sind in die

---

[8] Böhlig, p. 18; K. Rudolph, "Böhlig, Alexander, u. Pahor Labib: *Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Hag Hammadi*," *Theologische Literaturzeitung, 90. Jahrgang* (1965/5), cols. 359-62, esp. col. 360.

[9] Doresse, p. 238.

[10] *Panarion haer.*, 38.2.5 (Holl, pp. 64.24f.).

[11] See below, p. 166.

Darstellung zugleich jüdische und hellenistische Elemente eingearbeitet oder bestimmen sie sogar. Auch das magisch-zauberische Moment fehlt nicht."[12] Yet in the space of an introduction, Böhlig could only point to the background of particular concepts without supporting argumentation. From Jewish sources came the figure of the little child who appeared to Paul and the old man of the seventh heaven.[13] From the Hellenistic "astronomisch-astrologisches Weltbild" came the dominant world-view of the Apocalypse as well as the representation of the old man of the seventh heaven as Kronos-Saturn.[14] From magic came the use of the sign in the seventh heaven.[15] To this Kasser added that the book mentioned in the fourth heaven reflected the Book of the Dead in the Egyptian religion.[16] Besides the fact that several of the above conclusions were incorrect, it was evident from the survey that a serious history of religions investigation of the Apocalypse remained to be done.

---

[12] Böhlig, p. 16.

[13] Ibid, pp. 16-17.

[14] Ibid., p. 17.

[15] Ibid.

[16] See the two articles by R. Kasser, "Textes Gnostiques: Remarques à propos des éditions récentes du Livre Secret de Jean et des Apocalypses de Paul, Jacques et Adam," and "Textes Gnostiques: Nouvelles remarques à propos des Apocalypses de Paul, Jacques et Adam," Le Muséon, LXXVIII, 1-2 (1965), pp. 71-98, 299-306, esp. p. 77.

With regard to the nature and character of the document, even less has been done. Böhlig called attention to the change from the third person, to the first, back to the third, and finally back again to the first person.[17] Against Böhlig's observation that such changes also occurred elsewhere in Apocalyptic literature and his warning regarding the difficulty of undertaking a source critical investigation of so brief a document, Kasser has proposed that the present text represented an abridgment of a longer document in which Paul spoke always in the first person and each heaven was given equal treatment with regard to the description of its contents.[18] In the final analysis, Kasser's hypothesis only verified the appropriateness of Böhlig's warning. For the places where Kasser supposed that an abridgment was made did not conform to the places where the change of persons occurred. That is to say, the change of persons cannot be explained as the result of an abridgment in the description of the various heavens. For all the changes in person except one occurred before the first heaven was described, and the one exception occurred in the fourth heaven which received the largest treatment of all the heavens. With regard to the unequal treatment of the heavens, Kasser's abridgment theory represented an attempt to explain a phenomenon of the document from without whereas it might possibly be explained from within, i.e. from the document's own nature and intention. This, however, only points up a second glaring lacuna in the study of the Apocalypse. For no one has yet investigated the document as a document, i.e. with regard to its nature and intention. From Doresse on it has simply been asserted that the Apocalypse was related to II Cor. 12.2-4 without explaining in what manner it was related to the Pauline text.[19]

---

[17] Böhlig, p. 16.

[18] Kasser, p. 76.

There existed, therefore, two serious lacunae in the study of the Apocalypse of Paul: (1) the history of religions investigation and (2) the inquiry into the nature and intention of the document. It is the purpose of this present investigation to contribute to the filling of those two lacunae. The investigation proceeded by way of a translation and analysis of the text while the text itself determined the structure of the investigation.

Exclusive of the incipit and colophon, the Apocalypse occupied 190 extant lines of Coptic text. Of these, 168 were devoted to the treatment of four scenes:

---

[19] Doresse, p. 237, n. 143; Puech, "Les Nouveaux Écrits . . . ," p. 35; Böhlig, p. 16.

55 to the opening revelation scene, 77 to the two scenes of the fourth and fifth heavens, and 36 to the scene in the seventh heaven. Beyond the fact that the material of the Apocalypse was thus concentrated in the four scenes delineated, these same four scenes were related thematically. The scenes of the fourth and fifth heavens both dealt with the judgment of souls, and the opening revelation scene and the scene in the seventh heaven had to do with the interpretation of Paul's ascension. Hence, the Apocalypse was divided thematically: (1) the judgment of souls and (2) the interpretation of Paul's ascension. It was this thematic structure of the text that determined the structure of the investigation. At the same time, however, these two thematic divisions corresponded approximately to the two-fold purpose of the investigation. For the second theme, which dealt with the interpretation of Paul's ascension, coincided exactly with the investigation into the nature and intention of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the judgment of souls (the first theme) offered the largest, although not the only, possibility for studying the history of religions background of the Apocalypse. Hence, the history of religions investigation proceeded in large part, though not exclusively, by way of an analysis of the judgment scenes in the fourth and fifth heavens, and the inquiry into the nature and intention of the Apocalypse proceeded by way of an analysis of the

opening revelation scene and the scene in the seventh heaven. The outline of the dissertation reflected the structure and method of the investigation.

Translation

The following translation of the Apocalypse of Paul was based on the Coptic text as established in the edition of Böhlig and Labib and an independent collation. The numbers in the left hand margin of the translation represented the page and line of Nag Hammadi Codex V (Coptic Museum Inventory No. 10548), pp. 17-24 (=Plexiglass Nos. 11-18). The restorations of the text were those of Böhlig unless otherwise indicated. Where noted, Böhlig's restorations were indicated by the symbol "B", while those made by Kasser were indicated by the symbol "K".[20] Where "B" and "K" conflicted, the restoration accepted by the translator was cited in the first position in the appropriate note with the rejected form following in the second position. Where the restorations were those of the translator, the restored text was given without symbol in the first position of the appropriate note.

17 ⌊THE APOCALYPSE (ἀποκάλυφις) OF PA⌋UL

---

[20] K^1= Kasser, pp. 77-78; K^2= Kasser, p. 300

18.1

in

road. And [[21]

.5 saying: "[[22]

road to J[erusalem?" Then answered][23]

the little chil[d, saying:][24]

"Say your name that [[25]

you the road." [ ] was [

.10 He knew Pa[ul][26]

He wished to [speak to][27] gether with

him with his words in [order that (ἵνα)][28]

he find an opportun[ity to][29] speak

with him. Then answered the little

.15 child, saying: "I know

you, Paul, who you are. For

---

[21] K^1, [ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ], "he answered."

[22] K^1, [ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ϩⲛⲁϣ], "I shall go by which."

[23] ⲉⲑⲓ[ⲏⲙ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ]; B, ⲉⲑⲓ[ⲉⲣⲓⲭⲱ], "to Jericho"; K^1, ⲉⲑⲓ [ⲉⲣⲓⲭⲱ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ], "to Jericho. "Then answered." See below, pp. 127-28.

[24] B.

[25] K^2, ⲭⲉⲛ[ⲧⲁⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲙ], "that I may make known to."

[26] B. [27] B. [28] B. [29] B.

18.17-19.5

you are he who was blessed from
his mother's womb because (ἐπειδή) I have
[come][30]
to you that you may [go up above][31]
.20 to your fellow [apostles (ἀπόστολος).][32]
Therefore, [I have blessed you. Behold,][33]
I am he who [reveals the road][34]
18.23 [to][35] you. Let [
18.28
19.1 for (γάρ) [
end [a]ll which [
among the arch[ons (ἄρχων) of][36] these
powers (ἐξουσία),
the [a]r[chang]els (ἀρχάγγελος), [37] and the
author[ities][38]
.5 and [the][39] whole [world (κόσμος)][40] of the

---

[30] ⲀⲒ̈ [ⲈⲒ̈]; B, ⲀⲒ̈[ⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ], "I have called." See below, pp. 141-42.

[31] K^2. [32] K^1.

[33] Ⲁ[ⲒⲤⲘⲞⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ' ⲈⲒⲤ]; B, Ⲁ[ⲒⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ], I have called you."

[34] ⲠⲈⲦ[ϬⲀⲖⲠ ⲦⲈϨⲒⲎ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ]; K^2, ⲠⲈⲠ[ⲚⲀ ⲈⲦϢⲀϪⲈ ⲚⲘ], "the spirit who speaks."

[35] [Ⲛ]ⲀⲔ. [36] K^2. [37] K^2. [38] B.

[39] B. [40] B.

19.6-23

demons (δαίμων), the ⌊house⌉[41] of him who
reveals the bod⌊ies⌉[42] (σῶμα) to a soul-
(ψυχή) seed."
And after he finished that
word, he answered and said
.10 to me: "Awaken your mind (νοῦς),
Paul, and see that the mountain
upon which you tread is the mountain
of Jericho, in order that you may know the
hidden things in the things which are
revealed.
.15 Now (δέ) the Twelve Apostles (ἀπόστολος)
are those to whom you shall go. For (γάρ)
they are elect spirits (πνεῦμα). And they
will
greet (ἀσπάζεσθαι) you." He lifted
his eyes up, (and) he saw them.
.20 They greet⌊ed⌉ (ἀσπάζεσθαι) him. Then
(τότε) this
⌊little ch⌉ild[43] who was speaking
⌊to him sn⌉atched[44] him up
to ⌊the hei⌉ght[45] up to the third

---

[41] K2. [42] B. [43] B.
[44] B. "⌊mit dem⌉ er gesprochen hatte. . . ." [45] B.

19.24-20.9

heaven. And he pass[e̲d̲]
.25 beyond to the fourth [heaven. Then an-][46]
swered him the [Holy Sp̲]irit, (πνεῦμα),
saying: "Look
and behold your likeness [up-]
on the earth." And he loo[ke̲d̲]
.30 down and beheld those [who were upon̲][47]
the ear[t̲h̲]. He looked [
] upon [
20.1 [He loo̲]ked [up and he̲] saw[48]
the Twelve Apostles (ἀπόστολος)
at his right [and̲] at his left
in the creation (κτίσις). But (δέ) the
Spirit (πνεῦμα) was
.5 going before them. Then (τότε) I saw
in the fourth heaven that which was peculiar
to it (κατα γένος). I
saw then (δέ) the angels (ἄγγελος)
as they [were bring]ing[49] out
a soul (ψυχή) from the land of

---

[46] B. [47] B.

[48] [ⲀϤⲈⲒⲰ̲]Ⲣ̣Ⲙ [ⲈⲦⲠⲈ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲀϤ]ⲚⲀⲨ; K², [Ⲫ̄Ⲱ̲]Ⲥ̣Ⲧ̣Ⲏ̣Ⲣ̣ Ⲙ[ⲠⲈⲒ ⲔⲞⲤⲘⲞⲤ . . . .

[49] Ⲉ[ⲨⲈⲒ̲]ⲚⲈ ; B., Ⲥ[ⲞⲂ̲]ⲦⲈ≠ "nehmen," but see below, pp. 77-79.

20.10-25

.10 the dead. They placed it at the gate (πύλη)
of the fourth heaven. [An]d
the angels (ἄγγελος) were flogging (μαστιγοῦν)
it.
Then the soul (ψυχή) answered, saying:
"What was the sin which I committed
.15 in the world (κόσμος)?" Then answered the
toll collector (τελώνης), who dwells in the
fourth heaven, saying: "For you it was
not fitting to do all those lawless
deeds (ἀνομία) which are in the world
(κόσμος)
.20 of the dead." Then [an]swered
the soul (ψυχή), saying:
"Bring witness ⟨es⟩! Let them say
in which body (σῶμα) I committed lawless
deeds (ἀνομία).
[And be ple]ased[50] to bring a book[51]
.25 [that they may read in] it."[52] And then came

---

[50] [ⲚⲄⲞⲨ]ⲰϢ ; K², [ⲀⲤⲞⲨ]ⲰϢ , "she wished."

[51] B, read ⲚⲚⲞⲨϪⲰⲘ Ⲉ , "eine Generation, die."

[52] [ⲈⲨⲰϢ ϨⲒ]ⲰⲰϤ ; B, [ⲦⲀⲒ̈Ϯ ϨⲒ]ⲰⲰϤ , "ich angezogen habe"; K¹, [ⲚⲦⲀⲨϮ ϨⲒ]ⲰⲰϤ , "qu'on avait mis sur lui ⟨comme vetement⟩ . . . ." See below, pp. 96-100.

1

∠the three7[53] witnesses. Then an-
∠swered7 the first, saying:
"Was∠not (μή)7 I
∠in the7[54] body (σῶμα) ∠at the second hour7?[55]
.30 ∠I did not cea7se[56] to rise up against you
21.1 until ∠I found you7[57] in anger,
∠wrath7,[58] and envy." And then
answered the second, saying:
"Was not (μή) I
.5 in the world (κόσμος)? And I entered at
the fifth hour, and I saw you,
(and) I desired (ἐπιθυμεῖν) you. And ~~behold,~~
therefore, now I dispute with you concerning
the murders which you committed." Then answered
.10 the third, saying:

---

[53] K¹. [54] B.

[55] Following K's (K¹) emendation of ϪⲈ ⲠⲤⲚⲀⲨ to ⟨Ⲛ⟩ϪⲈⲠ ⲤⲚⲀⲨ.

[56] ∠ⲘⲠⲒⲞⲨⲞ_7Ⲩ; B, ∠...... ⲁ7ⲨⲦⲰⲰⲚ , "they raised themselves?;" K¹, ∠ⲈⲢⲈⲠⲘⲞ_7Ⲩ ⲦⲰⲰⲚ , "death raised itself." See below, p. 108.

[57] ϢⲀⲚ∠ϮϬⲚⲦ_7Ⲉ, so K¹. [58] ⲞⲨⲂ∠Ⲱⲗ_7Ⲕ, so K².

21.11-29

"Did I not (μή) come to you at the
twelfth hour of the day when
the sun was setting? I gave darkness to you
until[59] you perfected your sins."
.15 When the soul (ψυχή) heard these things,
it stared down, for it was
pitiful of heart. And then (τότε)it looked
up (and) was cast down.
When [the s]oul (ψυχή) was cast down,
.20 [it went into a][60] body (σῶμα) which had
been made ready for
[it. An]d[61] behold, the witnesses
were completed. M[y eyes][62]
[look]ed up, and I s[aw]
[the Sp]irit (πνεῦμα) who said to [me:]
.25 "Paul, come! Pro[ceed]
[to] me!" But (δέ) I, as I was go[ing],
the ga[te (πύλη)] opened, and
I went up to the fifth [heaven.]
Then (δέ) I sa[w] my fel[low apo-]

---

[59] Or, "so that," "in order that."

[60] K^2; B, [ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈⲨ]ⲤⲰⲘⲀ , "into a body."

[61] K^2. [62] B.

.30 stles (ἀπόστολος) who were g[oing with me]
22.1 and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) who was goi[ng]
with us.
And I saw a great angel (ἄγγελος)
in the fifth heaven, who held
an iron staff in his
.5 hand, and there were three other angels
(ἄγγελος)
with him. And I lo[oked] into
their face. But (δέ) they were striving
(ἐρίζειν) with each other, for flails
(μάστιξ)
were in their possession as they goaded the
.10 souls (ψυχή) to judgment (κρίσις).
But (δέ) I was going with the Spirit (πνεῦμα),
and the gate (πύλη) opened to me.
Then (τότε) I went up to the sixth heaven.
And I saw my fellow apostles (ἀπόστολος),
.15 who were going with me. And the Holy
Spirit (πνεῦμα) led me before them.[63]
And I looked up to the height and saw a

---

[63] K^1, on analogy with 20.4-5, emended 22.15-16 to read: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲓⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲓⲙ ⲙⲟⲉⲓ⟨ⲧ⟩ ϩⲁϫⲱⲟⲩ , "and the Holy Spirit led them." 22.21-23, however, has the gate opening only to Paul and the Holy Spirit.

great light which was shining down
into the sixth heaven. I answered
.20 and said to the toll collector (τελώνης)
who is in the sixth heaven: "[Open]
to me and the [Holy] Spirit (πνεῦμα)
[before] me!" He opened to [me and][64]
[I went][65] up to the seve[nth heaven.]
.25 [I saw][66] an elderly ma[n whose][67]
[face was lik]e[68] the light and [whose][69]
[garments were][70] white. [His][71]
[place (τόπος) was][72] in the seventh heaven
[which][73] shone more than the sun by
.30 [seven][74] times. Then answered
23.1 the elder and said to me:
"Whither will you go, Paul,

---

[64] K^2. [65] K^2; B, [ΝΤΠΥΛΗ], "the gate." [66] B.

[67] ΝΡΩ [ΜΕ ΕΡΕΝΕϤ]; K^1, ΝΡΩ [ΜΕ ΕϤ], "man who."

[68] [ϨΟ ΕΙΝ]Ε; K^1, [ΠΕΙΡ]Ε, "was like."

[69] K^1. [70] K^1.

[71] ΝΕΡ[ΕΝΕϤ]; K^1, ΝΕΡ[ΕΟΥΦΩ]

[72] [ΤΟΠΟϹ]; K^1, [ϹΤΗΡ]. K's reading in n.70, 71, "there was a light."

[73] K^1. [74] K^1.

who is blessed and was separated from his mother's womb?" But (δέ) I looked at the Spirit (πνεῦμα), and he was nodding his head, and he said to me: "Speak to him!" And I answered and said to the elder: "I will go to the place (τόπος) whence I came." And then answered to me the elder: "Whence are you?" But I answered, saying: "I will go[75] down to the world (κόσμος) of the dead in order that I might lead captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία) which was led captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) in the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία) of Babylon." Then the elder answered me, saying: "How will you find the power to withdraw from me? Look and behold these principalities (ἀρχή) and these powers (ἐξουσία)." Then answered [the] Spirit (πνεῦμα), saying: "Give to him [the]

---

[75] B suggested emending to ΝΕΪΝΑΒΩΚ , "I am about to," or ΝΕΑΪΒΩΚ , "I had gone." Against this, see below, pp. 203-204.

sign (σημεῖον) which you have, and [he will]
.25 open for you." And then (τότε) I gave [to
him]
the sign (σημεῖον), (and) he turned his [face]
down toward his creation
and those who [are] his powers (ἐξουσία).
And then (τότε) the seventh
.30 hea[ven] opened, and we went up [to the]
24.1 Ogdoad (ὀγδοάς). Then (δέ) I saw the
Twelve Apostles (ἀπόστολος). They
greeted (ἀσπάζεσθαι) [me], and we went
up to the ninth heaven. I greeted
.5 (ἀσπάζεσθαι) all those who were in the
ninth heaven, and we went up
to the tenth heaven. And I greeted
(ἀσπάζεσθαι) my fellow spirits (πνεῦμα).
24.9 THE APOCALYPSE (ἀποκάλυψις) OF PAUL

CHAPTER II

ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE DEAD IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

In the narrative of the ascension of the Apostle to the highest heaven and the judgment scenes of the fourth and fifth heavens, the Apocalypse of Paul provided a rather complete eschatology of the individual soul. For the ascension of the Apostle was analogous to the post-mortem ascent of the superior soul in other sources, and the judgment scenes set forth a view concerning the fate of the inferior soul at death. The history of religions problem in the Apocalypse thus has to do in large part with eschatology. Therefore, as part of the history of religions investigation, it is necessary in this chapter to make a survey of eschatology in general and the concept of the judgment of the dead in particular in Egyptian, Iranian, Greek, and Jewish Apocalyptic thought.

The Judgment of the Dead in Egyptian Eschatology[76]

> They say: "Welcome, safe and sound!"
> To him who reaches the West.[77]

These lines from a tomb belonging to the reign of Hor-emheb (cir. B.C. 1349-1319), the last of the pharoahs of the Empire, reflect what has been identified as the earliest Egyptian view regarding the fate of the dead.[78] For already before the Pyramids were built, the ancient Egyptians believed that the dead continued to enjoy a form of existence in the necropolis. In his tomb on the western slopes, the dead had his "eternal dwelling," and there supplied with the needs of physical subsistence he enjoyed an extension of earthly life.[79] Over against the idea of the life in the tomb, however, the Pyramid Texts already attested the belief in celestial immortality.

---

[76] To the whole, see Hermann Kees, *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter*. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1926); James H. Breasted, *The Dawn of Conscience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933); A. H. Gardiner, *The Attitude of the Ancient Egyptians to Death and the Dead* (Cambridge: University Press, 1935); Joachim Spiegel, *Die Idee vom Totengericht in der ägyptischen Religion* (Gluckstadt and Hamburg: J. J. Augustin, 1935); J. Zandee, Death as an Enemy (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960). H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952), pp. 334ff.

[77] Translated by John A. Wilson in James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (2d ed. rev.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), pp. 33-34, hereafter cited as *ANET*.

[78] Kees, p. 30; Spiegel, p. 11.

[79] Kees, pp. 30, 37, 50-52; Spiegel, p. 11ff.; Breasted, p. 55. Note the food and drink provided in the cult of the dead in the Pyramid Texts (e.g. *ANET*, p. 325).

Den Ach zum Himmel, den Leib zum Erde.[80]

In this formula from the Pyramid Texts the belief in the celestial immortality of the soul was expressed. For the Ach was the "verklärte Gestalt," the shining form which one received at death,[81] and the ascension of the dead to heaven could be referred to as "wenn er zu seiner 'verklärten Gestalt' (Ach) geht."[82] With the ascension of the Ach should be associated the belief that the dead became a star,[83] probably one of the "Imperishable Ones" of the northern heaven, the circumpolar stars.[84] "Du sehr hoher unter jenen unvergänglichen Sternen, du gehst nicht unter, ewiglich."[85] It was not this old popular belief in stellar immortality which won out, however, but the belief in the solar immortality of the soul.

When toward the middle of the Old Kingdom the sun

---

[80] Kees, p. 57 citing Pyramid Text 472. Cf. the phrase "his soul is in heaven, his body is in the West" from the hymn to Amon-Re in the Leyden Papyrus I 350, iv. 21-26 (ANET, p. 368).

[81] Kees, pp. 57-58.

[82] Kees, p. 58, quoting Pyramid Text 472.

[83] So Spiegel, p. 11, n. 3.

[84] Breasted, p. 73-74; Kees, pp. 131-35.

[85] Kees, p. 133, citing Pyramid Text 878 (log. 464).

B

worship of Heliopolis was established as the religion of the realm, the god-king was believed to ascend at death to the region and realm of his father, the sun-god, Atum-Re.[86] Accordingly, the land of the dead was no longer located in the West, now understood as the place of the setting of the sun, but in the eastern heavens, the place of the sun's rising.[87] The ascent to the eastern skies was accomplished by flight, by mounting a sunbeam, or by means of a ladder.[88] Along the way, the ascending king was confronted by various dangers and threats from demonic beings.[89] These were averted by magical means, including the magical use of names.[90] Of special interest were the interrogation scenes in which the ascending king engaged in a dialogue designed to prove his right to proceed.[91] Among these was the interrogation by the Ferryman who transported the king across "the winding sea" in the eastern heavens to the dwelling of the gods.[92] There in the celestial paradise were the "Field of Offerings," also called the "Field of Reeds" and the "Field of Life," and the "Tree of Life," the holy sycamore.[93]

---

[86] Kees, pp. 31, 33, 35f., 89ff., 101-45, esp. 101, 120; Breasted, pp. 75ff., 83-93.

[87] Kees, pp. 89ff.; Breasted, pp. 78-79.

[88] Kees, pp. 102-106. See the ascent by the "staircase" in the Pyramid Text translated in ANET, p. 327, curse "b".

[89] Kees, pp. 108f., 117-18; Breasted, pp. 79-81.

[90] Kees, pp. 109, 117; Breasted, pp. 76-77, 80. E.g. the curse against the gods who would hinder the ascent of the king in ANET, p. 327, curse "b".

[91] Kees, pp. 111ff., 117-18; Breasted, pp.77, 80-81.

Into the doctrine of the ascension of the deceased king, which derived from the theology of the priests of Heliopolis, other elements were introduced which derived from the religion of Osiris. Having been identified with a pre-historic king of Egypt, Osiris became a symbol of the dead king whose successor was identified with Horus, the son of Osiris.[94] Hence, in the mortuary texts the formula "Osiris NN" was employed to affirm the identity of the dead king and the dead and resuscitated Osiris.[95] This combination of Heliopolitan and Osirian theology resulted in a situation in which the sun-god, Atum-Re, received his son, the dead king, as Osiris. This situation was well illustrated in the following text from the Pyramid of King Unis of the fifth dynasty (25th century B.C.):

---

[92] Kees, p. 111ff.; Breasted, pp. 76-77.

[93] Kees, pp. 134ff.; Breasted, pp. 75ff., 91-92. See the vignette depicting the "Fields of Peace" from the Papyrus of Nebseni, constituting chapter 110 of the Book of the Dead (Budge, pp. 170ff.).

[94] Kees, pp. 190, 201ff., 228; Breasted, pp. 99, 108.

[95] Kees, p. 217; Breasted, pp. 112ff.

> O Atum, the one here is that son of thine, Osiris,
> whom thou hast caused to survive and to live on.
> He /Osiris/ lives -- (so also) this King Unis lives.
> He does not die -- (so also) this King Unis does
> not die.
> He does not perish -- (so also) this King Unis
> does not perish.[96]

Still more complicating was the fact that, in addition to his role as the dead king, Osiris was also identified with the god of the dead as "the Foremost of the Westerners."[97] It was this identification of the dead king with Osiris as the god of the dead in the West, now regarded as the realm beneath the earth through which the sun passed during the night, that eventually led to the dominant view that the dead went to the underworld kingdom of Osiris.[98]

To summarize, the oldest view that the eternal dwelling was in the tomb was displaced in the Old Kingdom by the belief that the king ascended at death to the realm of the sun-god in the East. In the time of troubles, which followed upon the dissolution of the Old Kingdom, and in the Middle Kingdom a process of democratizing took place in which the prerogatives of the king with regard to life after death were appropriated first by the nobility and then by the common man.[99] Hence the common man now ascended in the role of the dead and resuscitated Osiris to the realm of Atum-Re in the eastern heavens. Eventually then, by virtue of the identification with Osiris as god of the dead, it was believed that every man descended at death to the underworld kingdom of Osiris.

---

[96] _ANET_, p. 32, text "b". See also Kees, pp. 199-200, 225.

[97] _ANET_, p. 329; Kees, pp. 195-97, 336ff.

[98] Kees, pp. 91, 231-32; 429.

For the later development of Egyptian eschatology, it will suffice to point out two aspects: (1) the journey to the beyond and (2) the judgment of the dead. Both the so-called _Zweiwegebuch_ from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom and the Book of Gates from the Empire Period represent the later speculation regarding the dangers and difficulties of the journey of the dead which were already known in the Pyramid Texts. Written while the sun religion was still dominant, the _Zweiwegebuch_ treated the way of the dead to the celestial paradise.[100] It was thus intended as a guide book to the beyond, a guide book which pointed out the location of the demonic beings and the lake of fire which the dead must overcome or avoid as well as the gates and the gatekeepers from whom passage must be gained.[101]

---

[99] Kees, pp. 234ff., 429; Breasted, pp. 223ff.

[100] Kees, pp. 427, 29, 45-46.

[101] Kees, pp. 427-49, esp. 428, 30 and the vignette reproduced on p. 426 together with its interpretation on pp. 431ff.; Zandee, pp. 26-31.

The Book of Gates, on the other hand, already depicted the journey of the sun through the twelve gates of the underworld representing the twelve hours of the night.[102] Here too the dangers and difficulties of the journey of the dead were depicted as well as the fate of the righteous and the sinners in the underworld.[103]

The doctrine of the universal judgment of the dead had its roots in the sun religion of the Old Kingdom.[104] At this stage, however, it was not a matter of the general judgment of the dead but the litigation of specific crimes.[105] That is to say, one could be brought before the sun-god Re to answer for wrongs committed against another.[106] Re was thus the judge in the other world who ruled between litigants as he did in the law suit between Horus and Seth.[107] Hence Re was the upholder of justice in the other world as was the king in this world. Indeed Spiegel has pointed to what he described as the necessity of the dead king to appear before Re to establish his legitimacy as the divine son by demonstrating his conformity to an absolute standard of justice.[108] According to Spiegel it was this necessity of the dead king to justify himself before Re that the later doctrine of the general judgment of the dead derived.[109]

---

[102] Breasted, p. 269; Zandee, p. 4.

[103] Zandee, pp. 4-5, 21f., 35.

[104] Kees, p. 155; Spiegel, p. 17.

[105] Kees, pp. 152f., 156; Breasted, p. 250.

[106] Breasted, p. 250.

[107] Kees, pp. 155, 328-30; Breasted, pp. 29-42; ANET, pp. 4, 14ff., 367.

Already in the "Instruction for King Meri-Ka-Re" from the feudal age between the Old and the New Kingdoms one was exhorted to act justly because of the coming day when one would be judged in the other world.

> The council which judges the deficient, thou knowest that they are not lenient on that day of judging the miserable, the hour of doing (their) duty. It is woe when the accuser is one of knowledge. Do not trust in length of years, (55) for they regard a lifetime as (but) an hour. A man remains over after death, and his deeds are placed beside him in heaps.[110]

Similarly, in the Coffin Texts one also hears of the "balances" in which a man's deeds would be weighed "on the day of Reckoning."[111] Then by the beginning of the Empire the doctrine of the judgment of every man at his death had been fully established.[112] By that time, however, the judge was no longer Re but Osiris just as the dwelling of the dead was no longer in the heavens but in the underworld.[113]

---

[108] Spiegel, p. 17. [109] *Ibid.*

[110] *ANET*, p. 415.

[111] Breasted, p. 251.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

The texts for the judgment scene are contained in what are now designated chapters 17 and 125 of the Book of the Dead, dating respectively from the 11th and 18th dynasties.[114] The judgment itself took place in the "Broad-Hall of the Two Justices" before Osiris at the head of a collegium of judges. As the oldest elements of the judgment scene, Spiegel cited the so-called Negative Confession and the weighing of the heart, which he described as ethically oriented and attributed to the religion of the sun-god Re.[114] To this might also be added the references to both divine and human witnesses who would bring charges against the deceased before the tribunal.[115] However, as Spiegel has pointed out, the originally ethically determined judgment was transformed by the influence of magic, and according to Spiegel the magical element derived from the religion of Osiris.[116] In any event, the present texts contain, in addition to the Negative Confession, i.e., the protestation of innocence, and the weighing of the heart, charms to prevent the heart as well as human and divine witnesses from speaking against the deceased,[117] the magical use of names to render the judges and accusers powerless,[118] and interrogation scenes in which the deceased employed magical formulae to gain passage into the presence of Osiris.[119]

---

[113] Budge, pp. 46-59, 188-201. See the reproduction of the vignette for the judgment of the dead from the Papyrus of Ani as the frontispiece to Budge's translation of the Book of the Dead. On the dating, see Spiegel, p. 45. In addition to Spiegel, see the discussion of the judgment by Breasted, pp. 250-271, and Zandee, pp.31-41.

[114] Spiegel, pp. 54, 62, 70, 81.

[115] ANET, p. 35f.

Iranian Eschatology and the Judgment of the Dead[120]

The religion founded by Zarathustra was distinctive in maintaining a dual eschatology. That is to say, Zoroastrianism taught both an individual eschatology at death and a cosmic eschatology. Zarathustra himself had understood the history of the world as a unified whole beginning with the creation and terminating in an ordeal of purification.[121] He believed himself to be living "au dernier tournant de l'existence"[122] just before "la réforme de l'existence."[123] At the end of the world the wicked would be destroyed in the molten metal of the ordeal and the righteous would enjoy life on the purified earth. In the later Avesta the eschatological drama was elaborated to include an eschatological redeemer, a last battle between the forces of good and evil, and the resurrention of the dead.[124] No significant changes were introduced in the

---

[116] Spiegel, pp. 70, 81.

[117] Budge, p. 192; *Book of the Dead* 30 (Budge, pp. 77-80).

[118] *ANET*, p. 35.

[119] *ANET*, p. 36; Budge, pp. 190, 198-200.

[120] To the subject in general, see H. Hübschmann, "Die parsische Lehre vom Jenseits und jüngsten Gericht," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, V (1879), 203-45; W. Bousset, "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, III-IV (1900-1901), 136-69, 229-73, esp. 159-169; Reprint (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962). N. Soderblom, *La Vie future d'après le mazdéisme à la lumière des croyances parallèles dans les autres religions: étude d'eschatologie comparée* ("Annales due Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes," Vol. IX; Paris: 1901); A.V. Williams Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies*: (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928); J.D.C. Pavry, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life* (2d ed. rev.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1929); Geo Widengren, "Stand und Aufgaben der iranischen Religionsgeschichte," *Numen*, I-II (1954-55), 16-83, 47-134, esp. 34-35; Reprint (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955).

---

[121] H.S. Nyberg, Die Religionen des alten Iran, trans. H.H. Schaeder (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1938), discussed the cosmic eschatology of Zarathustra on pp. 303, 226-32.

[122] Yasna 51.6. Unless otherwise indicated the translation of the Gāthās employed here was that of J. Duchesne-Guillemin, Zoroastre: Étude critique avec une traduction commentée des Gāthā (Paris: G. P. Maisonneuve, 1948), commentary and translation pp. 161-289.

[123] Yasna 48.2.

[124] For the later Avesta see Yasts 13 and 19. English translation by J. Darmesteter, The Zend-Avesta (2d ed. rev.; New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1898), pt. ii, 179-230, 286-309.

Pahlavi books.[125]

Already in the oldest part of the Avesta, the Gāthās of Zarathustra, a sharp distinction was made between the recompense received by the righteous and sinners after death.[126]

> Qui se range avec le juste, plus tard la
> splendeur lui appartiendra.
> Longue durée de ténèbres, mauvaise nourriture,
> lamentations:
> C'est à une telle existence que vous conduira,
> méchants,
> Par vos propres actes, votre conscience [*daēnā*].[127]

The righteous and the sinners would inherit respectively the light and the darkness. More specifically, the souls of the just would be guests in the house of Ahura Mazdah, while the souls of the wicked "vont a leur recontre avec des aliments mauvais. De la maison du mal [*drug*], vraiment, ils seront les hôtes."[128]

In another of the Gāthās where the recompense of the dead was again the subject, it was indicated that the separation of the blessed and the accursed occurred at the Činvat Bridge. For in view of the loyalty of his followers, Zarathustra claimed, "avec eux tous je traverserai le Passage du Trieur!"[129] With respect to his enemies, however: "Ceux-là, leur propre âme et leur propre conscience [*daēnā*] les tourmenteront quand ils arriveront au Passage du Trieur pour devenir à jamais les hôtes de la maison du Mal [*drug*]."[130] That which Duchesne-Guillemin designated the *Passage du Trieur*[131] was the Činvat Bridge which Nyberg defined as "der Weg der Seele zum Himmel in der Ekstase und nach dem Tode."[132] In the present text the Činvat Bridge was a *Passage du Trieur* in as much as it was there that the wicked were tortured by their soul and conscience prior to their departure to the House of Lie while the faithful were led across the bridge by Zarathustra. That is to say, it was at the entrance to the Činvat Bridge that the sinners were separated from the just.

---

[125] For the Pahlavī, see Bundahišn 30. English translation by R. C. Zaehner, *The Teachings of the Magi* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956), pp. 145-50.

[126] H. S. Nyberg, pp. 179-80, cited Yasna 31.20; 44.19; 45.3 (7 ?); 48.4; 51.14 as evidence of the separation of the blessed from the accursed in the Gāthās.

[127] Yasna 31.20; cf. Nyberg, p. 206.

[128] Yasna 49.10, 11; cf. Nyberg, pp. 182-83.

Moreover, the reference to the torturing by the soul and conscience would suggest that the separation of the sinners and the saints was effected by a form of judgment, a suggestion enhanced by still another text from the Gāthās.

---

[129] Yasna 46.10.

[130] Yasna 46.11; cf. Nyberg, pp. 236-37 where this text was interpreted in his usual manner as applying to the ascent of the soul both in ecstasy and at death.

[131] "Way of the Separator." Against this translation, see Nyberg, p. 180.

[132] Nyberg, p. 184.

> Ainsi la conscience du méchant se gâte-t-elle la certitude du droit (chemin);
> Son âme (?) mise à nu (?) aura peur au Passage du Trieur,
> S'étant écartée, par ses propres actes,
> Du chemin de la Justice et de la langue.[133]

As the question marks indicated, there was some uncertainty with regard to which experience of the soul was the cause or occasion of its fear at the Činvat Bridge. In Schaeder's translation of Nyberg, the verb was enthüllen, 'to unveil, expose', and Nyberg explained the idea as referring to "die Enthüllung des wirklichen Wesens, die stattfindet, wenn die Seele der himmlischen Welt gegenübergestellt wird."[134] It would appear, therefore, that the soul (urvan) of the sinner suffered anxiety at the Činvat Bridge and that this anxiety was associated with the stripping or disclosure of its true character. This unveiling of the soul would constitute a form of judgment by which the saints and sinners were separated. Hence in terms of the contextual meaning at least, Pavry was correct in translating: "And his soul shall suffer anguish at the Judgment (aka) of the Chinvat Bridge. . . ."[135]

---

[133] Yasna 51.3.

[134] Nyberg, p. 184.

In the references to the Činvat Bridge in the later literature, the allusions to a judgment scene became more and more explicit. Indeed already in the later Avesta one finds an allusion to an interrogation of the souls when they arrived at the bridge. Whereas "(the soul) of wicked and righteous alike proceeds along the paths created by Zurvan (Time) to the Činvat bridge created by Mazdāh (Ohrmazd),"[136] beyond that point the souls of the wicked were dragged "to Darkness" while the souls of the righteous were led "across the Chinvat Bridge on that span to the spiritual Yazatas (angels)."[137] At the entrance of the bridge, there were those (judges?) who "demand of the consciousness and soul that share of worldly goods given in the material world."[138] That is, "dort wird dann die Seele nach ihrem Anteil an der materiellen Welt befragt."[139] Then in the Pahlavī texts the judgment at the Činvat Bridge was explicitly described. One reads, for instance, in the Bundahišn (12.7) of the Mountain of Judgment at the middle of the world on which "the Kinvar bridge stands; and they take account of the soul at that place."[140] It was "Rašn, Aštāt, and Zāmdāt . . . whose place is beyond the Činvat Bridge who . . . bring the souls of men to account for what they have done of good and evil."[141] These three figures associated with the judgment of the soul together with the three, Mihr, Srōsh, and Rashn, in the parallel text in the Mēnōk i Khrat (1.76) remind one of the triumvirate of judges in Plato's myth of the judgment.[142] However, in the Mēnōk i Khrat passage it was the last named of the three, i.e. Rashn, or Rašnu, the old Avestan god of the ordeal to whom the twelfth Yast was dedicated,[143] who presided over the judgment at "the lofty and awful Bridge of the Requiter /i.e. the Činvat Bridge/ to which every man whose soul is saved and every man whose soul is damned must come."[144]

---

[135] Pavry, pp. 55; cf. also p. 51.

[136] Vivēvdāt 19.29 according to the translation in the excellent collection of texts and translations in R. C. Zaehner, Zurvan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 273-451, esp. p. 275.

[137] Vidĕvdāt 19.30 according to the translation of Pavry, pp. 65-66.

[138] Vidēvdāt 19.29 as translated by Pavry, p. 64.

[139] Nyberg, p. 181.

---

[140] According to the translation by E. W. West, Pahlavi Texts ("The Sacred Books of the East," Vol. V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1880), pt. I, p. 36.

[141] Bundahišn 3.17 as translated by Zaehner, Zurvan, p. 335.

[142] See the translation of this important eschatological passage of the Mēnōk i Khrat (1.71-124) in Zaehner, The Teachings . . ., pp. 133-38, esp. 134.

[143] Nyberg, p. 64.

[144] Mēnōk i Khrat 1.74, Zaehner, The Teachings . . ., p. 134.

Here every soul

> will (needs submit) to the weighing (of his deeds) by the righteous Rashn who lets the scales of the spiritual gods incline to neither side, neither for the saved nor yet for the damned, nor yet for kings and princes: (77) not so much as a hair's breadth does he allow (the scales) to tip, and he is no respecter (of persons), (78) for he deals out impartial justice both to kings and princes and to the humblest of men.[145]

To summarize, it has been shown from the Gāthās: (1) that the souls of the just and the wicked were transported respectively to the abode of bliss in the celestial realm of Ahura Mazdah and to the place of punishment in the dark-dwelling of the Lie and (2) that the separation of the righteous and the sinners took place at the Činvat Bridge. That this separation was effected by a judgment at the Činvat Bridge was clearly demonstrated from the Pahlavī texts, and allusions to this judgment were found in the interrogation of the soul in the later Avesta (Vd. 19.29) and in the references to the stripping of the soul and the torturing by the soul and conscience at the Činvat Bridge in the Gāthās (Ys. 51.13; Ys. 46.11). It may be concluded, therefore, that in Zoroastrian eschatology the souls of the dead were judged at the Činvat Bridge and thereby separated for their recompense either in the celestial dwelling of Ahura Mazdah or in the dark place of punishment.

---

[145] Mēnōk i Khrat 1.76-78, Zaehner, The Teachings . . ., p. 134.

Beyond this it will suffice to delineate the main lines of the eschatological myth. For the first three days and nights after death, the soul remained at the head of the corpse reciting one of the sacred Gāthās, a Gāthā of happiness in the case of the righteous and a Gāthā of lamentation in the case of the wicked.[146] To this the Pahlavī texts added that during this time (1) the demon Vizarsh and his associates struggled with the righteous Srōsh over the soul,[147] (2) the soul was appropriately clothed either in "white raiment" or in "torn and stinking rags,"[148] and (3) the soul suffered the experience of reviewing its former deeds.[149] Then at the dawn of the fourth day, the soul of the righteous and wicked alike set forth on the way to the Činvat Bridge.[150] Already in the

---

[146] Yast XXII. 2-4, 20-24 in the translation of James Darmesteter, *The Zend-Avesta* (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1898), pt. ii, pp. 314-15, 318-19.

[147] Indian Bundahišn 28.18 (West, pp. 108-109); Iranian Bundahišn 30.2,3 (translated by Pavry, pp. 12-13).

[148] Pahlavī Rivayats 23.1-4, 18-21, cited by Pavry, pp. 14, 23.

[149] Mēnōk i Khrat 1.102 (Zaehner, *The Teachings. . .*, p. 136); Dātastān i Dēnik 24.3-4; 25.3-4 as translated by E. W. West, *Pahlavi Texts* ("The Sacred Books of the East," Vol. XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882), pt. ii, pp. 54-56.

[150] Vidēvdāt 19.29 (Zaehner, *Zurvan*, p. 275).

Avesta one finds that the soul of the wicked was seized and led away in bonds to the Činvat Bridge by the demon Vizarsh, and although none was mentioned one would expect a correlative psychopompos for the righteous.[151] In the Pahlavī texts it was the blessed Srōsh and his associates who led the righteous soul to the Činvat Bridge while the wicked were led by the demon Vizarsh and his company.[152] Next came the judgment, and after that the soul was met by its daēnā, the conscience or transcendent self.[153] For the unjust the daēnā appeared in the form of an old hag who led the soul to hell,[154] but for the righteous she was a beautiful maiden who led the soul across the Činvat Bridge to the dwelling of Ahura Mazdah.[155]

Eschatology and the Judgment of the Dead in Greek Thought

The concept of the post-mortem judgment presupposed as its corollary the doctrine of posthumous rewards and punishments. According to the old Greek idea, the powerless and unconscious shade (εἴδωλον) of the dead was indiscriminately consigned to an undifferentiated underworld thus ruling out the idea of a judgment.[156] Alongside of the Greek idea, however, there appeared in Homer and Hesiod the Minoan mythologumenon of the Elysian Plain (Ἠλύσιον πεδίον), or the Islands of the Blessed (μακάρων νῆσοι).[157] To this land beyond the ocean at the end of the earth, the offspring and favorites of the gods were "translated" bodily while the fate of ordinary men remained the shadowy existence of the netherworld.[158] For the ordinary man it was not until the rise of the mysteries in the sixth century that he could hope for a blessed after-life among the initiated.[159] At least in Orphism and perhaps in other mystery cults, this distinction in the lot of the souls in the underworld was developed into a doctrine of rewards and punishments based on religious and moral considerations,[160] and it was in this context that the concept of the post-mortem judgment appeared.

---

[151] Ibid.

[152] Mēnōk i Khrat 1.74, 103 (Zaehner, The Teachings . . . , pp. 133-34, 136.

[153] On the daēnā, see Nyberg, pp. 119-20.

[154] Yast XXII.25-36 (Darmesteter, pt. ii, pp. 319-21); Mēnōk i Khrat i. 105-122 (Zaehner, The Teachings. . ., pp. 136-38).

[155] Yast XXII.9-18 (Darmesteter, pt. ii, pp. 315-18): Mēnōk i Khrat i. 81-100 (Zaehner, The Teachings. . ., pp. 134-36); Vidēvdāt 19.30-34 (Darmesteter, pt. i, pp. 219-20).

---

[156] On the early Greek concept of the shade and its existence in the underworld, see Erwin Rhode, Psyche, trans. W. B. Hillis from the 8th Ger. ed. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1925), pp. 3-54; Martin P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion (2d ed. rev.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955, 1961), I, 40-43, 192-97, 673. For a description of the shades, see Homer Od. x.490-95; esp. the nekyia at xi.29, 94, 145-49, 204-208, 218-22.

[157] Homer Od. iv.561-69; Hesiod Op. v.166-173. On the Egyptian background of this Minoan concept, see Nilsson, I, 325-26.

[158] Rhode, pp. 55-87; Nilsson, I, 324-26.

First then in Pindar's *Second Olympian Ode*, where the underworld was already divided into a place of suffering for the sinners and a place of bliss for the just, one encounters the idea of the post-mortem judgment: κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις . . . .[161] While the judge of the dead was thus still unnamed in Pindar, Hades himself, the underworld Zeus, was the judge according to Aeschylus.[162] Then in Plato's myth,[163] the soul upon separation from the body was led by its *daimon* to "a meadow at the fork of the road" where it faced judgment before a *collegium* composed of Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Aiakos.[164] From the place of judgment the path divided, and the souls of the just were sent down the right hand path to the Islands of the Blessed while the souls of the unjust took the left hand road to Tartarus.[165] Upon the completion of their allotted time in the other world, the souls were brought back to this world by rebirth (παλιγγενεσία) i.e., by reincarnation (μετενσωμάτωσις).[166] In both Pindar and Plato the idea of the post-mortem judgment with rewards and punishments in the other world was accompanied by the doctrine of palingenesia, and this particular configuration reflected the influence of Orphism.[167]

---

[159] For the favored lot of the initiates in the underworld, see already the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* 480-89; Aristophanes *Ra*. 154-63, 455-59, cf. 273, and see 313-459 where the souls of the initiated constituted a chorus of frogs perpetuating the Eleusinian cult in the underworld. See also Plato *Phd*. 69c.

[160] Nilsson, I, 826: "Der griechische Glaube an die Unterwelt als einen Ort der Strafen und der Belohnung entstand in den Mysterienkulten und wurde durch mythologische Vorstellungen befördert." Similarly also W.K.C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (2d. ed. rev.; London: Methuen & Co., 1952), pp. 148-93.

[161] Pindar *Ol*. ii.3.56-4.67; cf. *Fr*. 114. On the judgment of the dead in Greek thought, see L. Rühl, *De mortvorvm ivdicio* (*Nvmbvrgi ad Salam*: *Typis Lipperti et sociorvm*, 1903); reprinted as Vol. II.2 of *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* (Giessen, 1903).

[162] Aeschylus *Hik*. v. 230; *Eu*. 274.

---

[163] Plato *Grg*. 523^{a} -527^{e}; *Ap*. 41^{c} -42; *Phd*. 107^{d-e}, 113^{d}-114^{c}; *Phdr*. 249; *R*. x.614^{b-d}. On Plato's use of a pre-Platonic myth of the judgment, see Nilsson, I, 824.

[164] *Phd*. 107^{d-e}, 113^{d}; *Grg*. 523^{e}-524^{a}. For the same three judges, see also Demosthenes xviii.127. To the triumvirate of judges, Plato added in *Ap*.41^{a} "Triptolemos and other demigods who were righteous in their own life. . . ." The triumvirate appeared in the underworld scene of the late fourth century Altamura and Canosa vases from Magna Graecia inscribed on the former as Triptolemos, Aiakos, and Rhadamanthys-- *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, Ser. E, Taf. I, II. See on these, Jane Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (reprinted from the 3d ed. rev. Cambridge University Press; New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 599-623, esp. 609-10; Guthrie, pp. 187-91; Nilsson, I, 824-25.

[165] *Grg*. 534^{a}; *R*. x. 614^{c}.

[166] Παλαιὸς μὲν οὖν ἔστι τις λόγος οὗ μεμνήμεθα, ὡς εἰσὶν ἐνθένδε ἀφικόμεναι ἐκεῖ, καὶ πάλιν γε δεῦρο ἀφικνοῦνται καὶ γίγνονται ἐκ τῶν τεθνεώτων (*Phd*. 70^{c}). See also *Phd*. 107^{e}; *Phdr*. 248-249; *R*. x. 614^{d}-621. According to Plato, the soul spent 1,000 years in the other world before being reincarnated (*R*. x.615^{a}, 621^{d}, 617^{d}-618^{b}; *Phdr*. 249), while

According to the Orphic anthropogony, the present generation of mankind was created from the vapor which arose from the Titans who after having dismembered and devoured the infant Dionysus were struck down by Zeus'

---

[166](contd.) Pindar spoke of reincarnation in the ninth year (Fr. 127).

[167] Pindar Ol. ii.4.68ff.; Fr. 116, 127. Without excluding the possibility of external influences, Albrecht Dieterich, Nekyia (2d. ed.; Leipzig - Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 89-90, argued that the Orphico-Pythagorean doctrine of metensomatosis was formulated from older popular Greek beliefs. Rohde, pp. 345-47, thought that the doctrine was taken over by the Orphics from the Thracian cult of Dionysus. Against Dieterich, Franz Cumont, Lux Perpetua (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1949), pp. 196-98, argued for a possible Hindu origin suggesting that the idea reached the Greeks through Egypt. Now Nilsson, I, 197-99, 694-95, has agreed with Dieterich against Cumont for the Greek origin of the Orphic doctrine of metensomatosis. As for Plato's dependence upon "ancient and sacred logoi," see Phd. 69c, 70e; Ep. 7.335a. On the hieros logos as the title of the chief of the Orphic poems, see Guthrie, p. 15. On Plato's use of Orphic ideas, see Nilsson, I, 688-96, 820-23; Guthrie, pp. 156-71, 238-44.

thunderbolt.[168] Thus participating in both the Dionysian and "the Titanic nature," man was part divine and part evil.[169] He was, it may be said, himself a Titan bearing in himself a fragment of the devoured Dionysus. His

---

[168] The complete myth of the rending of Dionysus was found in Firmicus Maternus, *Error*., vi. It was known to Diodorus Siculus (II 62^{a} V. 75) and Plutarch (*Is. et Os.* 35.364f; *esu carn*. i.996^{c}, ii.997^{e}). Pausanias (viii.37.5) attributed to Onomacritus the inclusion of the myth into Orphic writings. Two indirect witnesses to the myth are to be seen in the toys found together with other evidences of Orphic Influence in the 6/5th cent. Kabiros Temple at Thebes (Guthrie, pp. 123-25; Nilsson, I, 671-72) and listed in a 3d cent. B.C. papyrus fragment in O. Kern, *Orphicorum fragmenta* (*Berolini*: *apud Weidmannos*, 1922). fr. 31, lines 28-30:

ε/ις τὸν κάλαθον ἐμβαλῖν
κ/ῶνος ῥόμβος ἀστράγαλοι
η ἔσοπτρος

For these were the toys by which the Titans lured the infant Dionysus to his death. Plato seems to have presupposed the myth when in *Lg*. iii.701^{c} he described man's rebellion against authority, divine as well as human, as a manifestation of his Τιτανικὴ φύσις . Overagainst the "Titanic nature" Plato (*Lg*. vi. 782^{c-d}) referred to the Ὀρφικοὶ βίοι which were characterized by abstinence from all things ἔμψυχος , and Aristophanes (*Ra*. 1032) claimed that Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετάς θ'ἡμῖν κατέδειξε φόνων τ'ἀπέχεσθαι. . . . Behind this abstinence from meat and the shedding of blood, one should see not only the Orphic doctrine of *metensomatosis* but also the myth of the rending of Dionysus-Zagreus as did Plutarch (*esu carn*. i.996^{c}, ii.997^{e}) in the same doctrine and practice of Empedocles. Indeed, like the Titans in the Orphic myth, Hate, according to Empedocles, implicated man in bloodshed and led to his subjection to *metensomatosis*. To this see H. Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (5th ed. rev. by W. Kranz; Berlin: Weidmann, 1934-38), fr. 31.B 115-119. On the myth in general, see Rohde, pp. 340-41, 596-98; Guthrie, pp. 69-78, 82-83, 107-109, 127-33, 137-42; Nilsson, I, 685-88.

[169] Τιτανικὴ φύσις , Plato *Lg*. iii.782^{d}.

Titanic body (σῶμα) was the tomb (σῆμα) in which his Dionysian soul was buried (θάπτειν), the enclosure (περίβολος) in which the soul was kept (σώζειν) as in a prison (δεσμωτήριον).[170] As the equation σῶμα = σῆμα = δεσμωτήριον already suggested, corporeal existence was not only a fallen mode of being but a form of punishment.[171] Hence, Plato claimed that according to the Orphics the soul was kept in its somatic prison because δίκην διδούσης τῆς ὧν δὴ ἕνεκα . . . .[172] What crimes were intended by Plato's vague "certain things" cannot be known for sure, but there were two possibilities. First, there was evidence that according to Orphic teaching the soul could sin in the other world as well as this and that reincarnation was the punishment entailed for sins committed in the other world.[173] In the second place, which seems more likely, Plato could have intended by the "certain things" the original sin committed against Dionysus, the fate of which was man's subjugation to the wheel of rebirth, his patromony from the Titans.[174] In either event, the soul was incarnated because of crimes committed, and according to Plato it remained subjected to the body "until it paid the penalty in full. . . ."[175]

---

[170] Plato Cra. 400c. Cf. Phdr. 250; Philolaus Fr. 14 Diels; Pindar Fr. 116; Empedocles Fr. 112, 115, 125-126 Diels; Plutarch esu carn. 1. 996c where the Titanic element in man was called the ἄλογον καὶ ἄτακτον καὶ βίαιον.

[171] Empedocles Fr. 115 Diels; Philolaus Fr. 14 Diels.

[172] Plato Cra. 400c.

[173] Pindar Ol. ii.3.56ff. and the interpretation of this text in Basil L. Gildersleeve, Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes (reprint of the ed. New York 1890; Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, Publisher, 1965), p. 149 and Nilsson, I, 693. For this concept in the Hellenistic Period, see Plutarch de facie in orbe lunae 943d, 944c-d.

According to Plato the penalty was not paid and the soul released until it had spent 10,000 years on the wheel of rebirth, i.e. until it had been ten times on either side of death.[176] Only for the soul of the philosopher was the number of cycles reduced from ten to three. For after three thousand years, at the end of the third cycle of birth and death, the soul which had chosen each time the life of the philosopher was set free from the wheel.[177] Behind the favored position thus extended by Plato to the soul of the philosopher one should see the position of the initiate in Orphic teaching. For just as Plato elsewhere identified the true Βάκχοι of an Orphic proverb with the philosophers, he here compared philosophy to a mystery and the philosopher to the initiated,[178] and this would suggest that the term of the philosopher on the wheel of rebirth was taken over from the Orphic teaching where the soul of the initiate was released at the end of the third cycle. That this was the case may be further substantiated from Pindar where one also finds that the soul attained release after it had "persevered thrice on either side. . . .," i.e. at the end of the third cycle of birth and death.[179]

---

[174] So Guthrie, pp. 165, 174-75, 183, 214. To this see ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθος . . . . in Pindar Fr. 127 (cf. Ol. 11.4.68-71) and the phrase διὰ τὴν τελετὴν ἔτεμον ποινὰς πατέ[ρων]. . . .in a third century B.C. papyrus fragment (Kern, fr. 31, lines 3-4).

[175] Plato Cra. 400^{c}.

[176] Phdr. $284\text{-}249^{a}$. Cf. R. $x.615^{a\text{-}b}$, 621^{d}.

[177] Phdr. 249^{a}.

With regard to where the soul went upon its final liberation, a problem arose at the point of distinguishing between the eternal home of the soul and the paradise which it temporarily inhabited between incarnations. On his descent into Hades in Aristophanes' The Frogs Dionysus found not only the purgatory of the sinners but the paradise of the initiated located in the netherworld.[180] This same vision of Hades divided between the sinners and the initiated was attributed by Plato to a certain "Musaeus and his son."[181] That Pindar also located the interim paradise in the underworld was suggested by his description of the blessed upon whom the sun shone, while our world was dark, as οἱ κάτω.[182] Those who had attained release from the wheel of rebirth, on the other hand, traveled the royal road of Zeus beyond the tower of Cronos to the ocean bathed Islands of the Blessed where ruled the ancient Rhadamanthys.[183] If Pindar thus distinguished between the temporary paradise and the eternal home of the soul by locating the former in the underworld and the latter on the Islands of the Blessed, this particular distinction was not maintained by Plato.

---

[178] Phd. 69ᵉ; Phdr. 249.

[179] Ol. ii.4.68ff. The idea of three cycles was also preserved by Herodotus (2.123) and suggested by the phrase "thrice ten thousand seasons" in Empedocles (Fr. 115 Diels).

[180] Ra. 145-157, 270-75, 310-460.

According to the myth in the *Gorgias* (534^a), from the place of judgment the path of the condemned led to

---

[181] *R*. ii. 363^{c-e}. At *R*. ii.364^e Musaeus and Orpheus were associated by Plato, and Plutarch (*Cim*. 1.521) identified the views of *R*. ii. 363^{c-e} as Orphic. That the views may also have been taken over by the Eleusinian mysteries was suggested by the reference to Musaeus' son, for his son according to tradition was Eumolpus, the legendary founder of the Eleusinian mysteries. To this see Nilsson, I, 688, n.4.

[182] *Fr*. 114. Guthrie, p. 170, was correct in pointing out that the name of the paradise was not given here, but he incorrectly identified it with the Islands of the Blessed as the eternal home of the soul by disregarding the term "below." Cf. *Ol*. ii. 4.6ff.

[183] *Ol*. ii. 4.68ff. That the final home of the redeemed was also identified with the Islands of the Blessed or the Elysian Plain in the Orphic Gold Tablets was suggested by the line πεδίον ... ἡγεμὸν...δῖε Ραδάμ⟨α⟩νθυ in the fourth century *Timpone grande* tablet (b) (Kern, fr.32^c).

Tartarus and the path of the justified to the Islands of the Blessed, and in the Republic (x. 614^{d-e}) the souls were seen both departing and returning by the same paths. Hence, in Plato's myth the interim paradise was the Islands of the Blessed. What was more important for the future was the fact that in the Apocalypse of Er the path to Tartarus led εις ἀριστεράν τε καὶ κάτω but the way to paradise εις δεξίαν τε καὶ ἄνω διὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.[184] Similarly in the Parable of the Charioteer the condemned were sent to a place "under the earth," while the just who had completed their first incarnation were sent to "some place in heaven."[185] Then in the Phaedo one finds a paradise located in the pure earth which lay above this earth in the heaven of the stars, i.e. in the ether.[186] Whether this ethereal paradise should be understood as corresponding to the home "some place in heaven" in the Phaedrus or as a different paradise where the soul went only at its final liberation was left unclear by Plato. However, while the interim paradise was "some place in heaven" according to the *Phaedrus*, the soul which had attained ultimate release again grew wings and soared aloft to its former home, presumably in the highest heaven of the gods.[187] Finally then in the *Timaeus* the astral immortality of the soul was clearly expressed, for here the soul upon its release from the wheel of rebirth ascended "to the home of its kindred star" from which it had been sown upon the earth.[188]

---

[184] R. x.614^{c}.

[185] Phdr. 249.

[186] In the Phd. 108^{c}-111^{c} Plato contrasted this earth with the pure earth which lies with the stars in the pure heaven of the ether (109^{b}), and in 111^{d}-113^{c} he described the underworld with its rivers, lakes, and Tartarus the abyss. In 113^{d}-114^{c} where the judgment followed by the punishment and reward of souls was described, the unjust were cast into Tartarus in the underworld (113^{d}-114^{b}) while the just were sent to their heavenly home in the pure earth above (114^{b-c}). Cf. the Pythagorean identification of the moon as the αιθερία γῆ (Simplicius in Cael. 512.19) and the sun and moon as the Islands of the Blessed (Iamblichus VP. 82).

For the Hellenistic-Roman Period it will suffice to illustrate how the old ideas were perpetuated and in what manner they were modified.[189] To begin with, the old device of locating both the condemned and the justified in different parts of the underworld was continued. This scheme was most dramatically executed by a second century relief from the tomb of Hieronymus of Rhodes which showed the company of the blessed separated by a pillar from the kingdom of Hades.[190] With regard to the judgment of the dead, the late fourth century Altamura and Canosa vases from Magna Graecia bore an underworld scene which included the judges, Triptolemos, Aiakos, and Rhadamanthys,[191] and the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus related the myth of the judgment of the dead while depicting the underworld divided between Tartarus and Elysium.[192] Belief in these ideas of the post-mortem judgment and the rewards and punishments in the underworld was attributed by Lucian of Samosata to the πολὺς ὅμιλος in the second century A.D.[193]

---

[187] *Phdr*. 246-248.

[188] *Ti*. 41^{d}-42^{e}, esp. 42^{b}; cf. Aristophanes *Pax* 832.

[189] To the subject in general, see L. Radermacher, *Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1903); F. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism* (Reprint of 1st ed. 1922; New York: Dover Publications, 1959); H. D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), pp. 81-99.

The katabasis of the sixth book of the Aeneid disclosed the judgment scene and the underworld divided between Tartarus and Elysium.[194] In addition, however, one also finds there the doctrine of palingenesia, or reincarnation after a term in the other world.[195] At this point one should consider the Orphic gold tablets, which due to their extensive geographical and chronological deployment constituted the single most important body of evidence for the period.[196] Eleven tablets in all have been found, one at Pharsalus in Thessaly dating from the fourth century,[197] one at Petelia and five at Thurioi in Southern Italy from the fourth/third century,[198] three at Eleuthernai in Crete from the second century B.C., and one at Rome from the second century A.D. The Petelia tablet was rolled up inside a case attached to a gold chain to be worn about the neck of the deceased as an amulet.[199] In fact, all the tablets were found in tombs where they had been buried with the dead. They were amulets designed to provide safe conduct for the soul through the underworld to the throne of Queen Persephone and on to the "abodes of the pure."[200] Being "a child of Ge and starry Ouranos, by name Asterios,"[201] the deceased had "paid the penalty for deeds not righteous."[202] He had "escaped the burdensome and painful wheel (κύκλος) and . . . arrived with swift feet at the longed for crown (στέφανος).".[203] Henceforth he would be "divine instead of mortal man."[204] In short, the soul had attained release from the wheel of rebirth and returned to its divine and immortal state. With this the evidence was complete. The old doctrines of the post-mortem judgment, of punishments and rewards in the underworld, and of metensomatosis and ultimate release were all attested for the Hellenistic-Roman Period. It only remained to point up one important modification in these ideas.

---

[190] Hiller von Gaertringen and C. Robert, "Relief von dem Grabmal eines rhodischen Schulmeisters," Hermes, XXXVII (1902), pp. 121ff.; Nilsson, II, 234-35.

[191] Wiener Vorlegeblätter, Ser. E. Taf. I and II; Harrison, pp. 599-623; Guthrie, pp. 187-91; Nilsson, I, 824-25.

[192] Ax. 371-72^{a}, esp. 371^{c-e}.

[193] Luct. 2-9; cf. Nec. 2, 10, 14. See on Lucian, Betz, pp. 81-99.

[194] Virgil Aen. vi. 540-678.

[195] Aen. vi. 713-51.

---

[196] On the tablets in general, see Dieterich, pp. 84-108; Harrison, pp. 572-99; Rohde, pp. 417-18; Guthrie, pp. 171-82; Nilsson, II, 235ff; A. Olivieri, *Lamellae Aureae Orphicae* (Bonn: A. Marcus and E. Weber's Verlag, 1915), p. 3ff.

[197] Νιλολάου Μ. Βερδελῆ, "ΚΑΛΚΗ ΤΕΦΡΟΔΟΧΟΣ ΚΑΛΠΙΣ ΕΚ ΦΑΡΣΑΛΩΝ," *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ* (1950-51), pp. 80-105. This tablet, assigned paleographically to the fourth century (p. 98), was discovered in the summer of 1950 (p. 80). Plate and transcription of the text on p. 99. To this see, Nilsson, II, 235, n. 3.

[198] For the text of these and the following tablets, see the ed. by Olivieri; Kern, fr. 32, 47; Diels, fr. 1. B 17-21; G. Murray, "Critical Appendix on the Orphic Tablets," in Harrison, pp. 659-73.

[199] See Guthrie's plates nos. 8 and 9.

The modification in question was the transposal of the underworld to the heavens. Although this phenomenon did not attain full expression until the Hellenistic-Roman Period, it was rooted in the fifth century. Already in Euripides one finds the idea that the souls of the dead inhabit the ether,[205] a concept whose popularity was attested by the official epitaph for the Athenians who perished in the revolt of Potidaea in 432: αἰθὴρ μὲν ψυχὰς ὑπεδέξατο, σώ[ματα δὲ χθών][206] In Aristophanes' Peace (v. 832) one finds the related idea that the soul arose to the air and became a star at death. Then, it will be recalled, Plato located the Islands of the Blessed in the ether and taught the stellar immortality of the soul.[207] There was indeed some evidence that the early Pythagoreans taught similar ideas.[208] For according to one of the akusmata preserved by Iamblichus, the Pythagoreans identified the sun and moon with the Islands of the Blessed.[209] In addition, it has also been said that the Pythagoreans held that the Milky

---

[200] Kern, fr. 32 d, e line 7; Diels, fr. 19, 19a; Murray, Compagno tablets b, c.

[201] Pharsalus tablet, lines 8-9.

[202] Kern, fr. 32 d,e, line 4; Diels, fr. 19, 19a; Murray, Compagno tablets b, c.

[203] Kern, fr. 32 c, lines 6-7; Diels, fr. 18; Murray, Compagno tablet a.

[204] Kern, fr. 32 c, line 10; Diels, fr. 18; Murray, Compagno tablet a.

---

[205] Euripides Supp. 531-36, 1140; El. 59; Hel. 1016; Fr. 487, 971 Nauck.

[206] IG, I², 945.

[207] See above pp. 49-51.

[208] To this, see Rohde, pp. 375-77; Cumont, Lux Perpetua, pp. 145-56; Nilsson, I, 701-703; W. Burkert, Weisheit und Wissenschaft (Nürnberg: H. Carl, 1962), pp. 98ff. For the last ref., I am indebted to Prof. H. D. Betz.

[209] Iamblichus VP xviii.82.

Way was the heavenly home of the soul.[210] For the antiquity of the Pythagorean belief in stellar immortality, one might also appeal to Aristophanes who in mentioning the idea related it specifically to the recently deceased Pythagorean poet, Ion of Chios.[211] In any event, it was altogether certain that already in the fifth century the concept of the celestial immortality of the soul was entertained alongside of the old belief in the underworld. It was just this belief in the celestial immortality of the soul that would eventually lead to the transposal of the underworld to the heavens in an attempt to reconcile this belief with the old eschatological mythologumena. Indeed it must be regarded as the beginning of this very process when Plato, if not the Pythagoreans before him, removed the Islands of the Blessed to the heavens.

Already the process was completed by one of the pupils of Plato and Aristotle, Heraclides Ponticus, who not only called the Milky Way the way of souls but also located Hades itself in the heavens.[212] In his particular cosmography, Heraclides was manifestly influenced by astrology, for he located the doors through which the souls ascended (and descended?) with reference to the signs of the zodiac.[213] Whereas the door located between the constellations Leo and Cancer should probably be regarded as that employed by the just on their ascent, the doors which he located one at Scorpio and the other between Aquarius and Pisces should be regarded as the doors to Hades. For according to the astrologers, the *inferiora signa* from Scorpio to Pisces represented the Hades half of the zodiac. That is to say, they located Hades, the Styx, Acheron, and Charon with his boat in the southern heaven.[214] With regard to Heraclides' designation of the Milky Way as the way of souls, it should also be pointed out that according to the astrologers the entrance to the Milky Way was guarded on either side by the two dog stars, Sirius and Procyon, who functioned as judges of the dead.[215]

---

[210] See the citations from the Neoplatonists Proclus and Porphyry in W. Gundel's article Γαλαξίας in PW, VII, 1, col. 560-71, esp. 563-64.

[211] Aristophanes Pax v. 832.

[212] Philoponos in Mete. Comm. Aristot. xiv.1.117.

---

[213] On Heraclides' reference to the three doors, see the report of Varro in Servius *Comm*. *Virgil Georg*. 1.34.

[214] Franz Boll, *ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ* I: *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis* (Leipzig-Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1914), pp.71-72.

[215] See the notice by Gundel in Franz Boll and Carl Bezold, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung* (2d ed. rev. by W. Gundel; Leipzig-Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1926), p. 189. According to another idea, the deities of the *dodekaōros* were the δικασταὶ τῶν ὅλων, and in the Pistis Sophia they were the judges of the dead. For this idea, see Boll, *Aus der Offenbarung*, pp. 35-36; Boll and Bezold, *Sternglaube* . . ., pp. 57, 187-91.

A different but not unrelated transposal of the underworld appeared in the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus.[216] While also removing the underworld to the heavens, the Axiochus employed a different cosmography. According to the myth of Gobryes which falls at the end of the dialogue, the heavens were divided into two equal hemispheres with that above the earth's sphere constituting the court of Zeus and that below the earth the kingdom of Pluto.[217] Hence it was the lower celestial hemisphere that was ὑπόγειος and ἀειδής, i.e. the ἄδηλος τόπος, hidden beneath the sphere of the earth.[218] Hither came the soul at death through the gates on the way to Pluto's realm and across the Acheron and Cocytus to be judged by Minos and Rhadamanthys in the plain of truth.[219] From judgment some were sent to the Elysian Plain while the others went to "Erebos and Chaos through Tartarus."[220] In short, the Axiochus transported the divided underworld of the mysteries complete with the judgment scene to the southern celestial hemisphere beneath the sphere of the earth.[221]

---

[216] The Axiochus has been dated as early as the fourth century and as late as the first century B.C. To this, see the article on Plato by H. Leisegang in PW, XX, 2 cols. 2342-2537, esp. 2366.12ff.

[217] Ax. 371^{a-b}.

[218] Ax. 371^{a}.

[219] Ax. 371^{b-c}.

[220] Ax. 371^{c-e}.

While Nilsson was quite correct in pointing out that the Axiochus assumed the geocentric world-view which conceived of the earth as a sphere suspended freely in space, he was mistaken to argue that the document represented an attempt to reconcile the old belief in the underworld with the new world-view.[222] For the theme of the dialogue was the immortality of the soul and specifically the celestial immortality of the soul. Hence when "Socrates" would prove the immortality of the soul, he concluded from man's ability to comprehend the heavenly bodies and their movements that there must be in man's soul a divine pneuma.[223] The correspondence thus implied between the knower and the known, between the soul and the heavenly bodies, was explicitly affirmed in the claim that "when the soul suffers it yearns and thirsts for heaven and its kindred ether, striving for the abode and dancing there," i.e. the circular movement of the heavenly bodies.[224] In short, the Axiochus taught the celestial immortality of the soul and based this doctrine on the affinity of the soul to the ether and the heavenly bodies. When, therefore, the dialogue ended with the myth of Gobryes, the latter should be understood as an attempt to reconcile the old belief in the underworld not with the new world-view, as Nilsson would have it, but with the belief in the celestial immortality of the soul. The new world-view with its concept of the lower celestial hemisphere simply provided a way of talking about celestial immortality while using the old *mythologumena* of the underworld. By this rather ingenious method the eternal home of the soul could be located at once in the heavens and under the earth. The important thing was that the *Axiochus* affirmed the doctrine of celestial immortality espoused by Plato and his fifth century predecessors and like Heraclides transposed the underworld to the heavens.

---

[221] Note the reference to the performances of the mystery rites in the region of the Blessed at Ax. 371^{d}.

[222] Nilsson, II, p. 241 Cf. Anaximander fr. in Diels from Ps. Plut. Strom. fr. 2; Hipp. Elench. 1.6; Arist. de caelo. ii.13.293^{a}, esp. ii.14.296^{b}.25; ii.14.297^{a}.9.

[223] Ax. 370^{b-c}.

[224] Ax. 366^{a}.

The transposal of the underworld was undertaken in still another manner. Based on a fundamental distinction between the region of the air extending from the earth to the moon and the region of the ether above the moon, a view was put forward which located the paradise of the righteous on the moon and sun while relegating the place of punishment to the sublunar sphere. This view found its most elaborate expression in the myths of Plutarch. According to the myth of Timarchus in *De genio Socratis* (589^{f}-593^{a}), the heavenly regions were divided between the upper gods and Persephone, and the range of the earth's shadow constituted the line of demarcation between the two regions.[225] That is to say, Persephone's realm was the sublunar sphere, and the upper world of the gods began at the moon. The earth's shadow, extending to the proximity of the moon, was identified with the Styx which was the path to Hades, and Hades itself, being thus situated in the sublunar region, was identified with the atmosphere between the earth and moon or even with the earth itself.[226]

In the myth related by Sulla in *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet* (941^{a}-945), nothing impure could ascent to the region beyond the limits of the earth's shadow, i.e. to the area of the moon.[227] Instead, when the soul was separated from the body at death, the latter returned to the earth from which it came but the former ascended to the region of the air between the earth and moon where it was purged of its impurities.[228] While the souls of the unjust were punished in the lower levels of the more turbulent air, the souls of the righteous were fumigated in the "mildest part of the air, which they call the meadows of Hades . . ." against the odors left behind by the body.[229] When its appointed stay in the aerial purgatory had ended, the soul ascended beyond to the Elysian Plain now situated on the moon.[230] After a certain time had elapsed, a "second death" was experienced in which the soul was separated from the *nous* and deposited with its native moon while the *nous* again soared aloft to the sun from which it had originated.[231]

---

[225] *De gen. Soc.* 591^{a}; cf. *De fac. lun.* 942^{d-f} where the sublunar realm was assigned to Demeter while Persephone's realm was the moon.

[226] *De gen. Soc.* 591^{a-c}; cf. *De fac. lun.* 940^{f}; Macrobius *Comm. in Som. Scip.* 1.11, 6.

[227] *De fac. lun.* 942^{f}.

[228] *Ibid.*, 943^{a-c}; cf. Virgil *En.* vi. 740ff. and the interpretation thereof by E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch* VI (4th ed.; Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1957), pp. 16-20, 33-34.

One also finds the separation of the souls of the just and the unjust in Plutarch's myth of Soli in *De sera numinis vindicta* (563^{b}-568), and here the sinners were assigned to the lower air while the righteous were ἄνωθεν ἐν τῷ καθαρῷ τοῦ περιέχοντος .[232] In addition, however, one also finds here the myth of the judgment with the *daimon* in the role of the *psychopompos* leading the soul to judgment as in Plato.[233] Instead of the traditional judges, however, the judge in this case was Dike.[234] While Dike committed the irremediable sinners to Erinys who cast them εἰς τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἀόρατον , the lesser criminals were subjected to punishments designed to purify and restore them to their former estate.[235] Yet for those not ready for restoration, the period of punishment was followed by a "second birth", i.e. reincarnation.[236] Here then in the myths of Plutarch one finds most of the old eschatological mythology including the judgment of the dead, the punishment for sins, reincarnation, and final release and restoration. That which was new was the location of Hades in the sublunar region. The location of Paradise on the moon and sun was, on the other hand, only a variant of the idea of celestial immortality familiar since the fifth century.

---

[229] *De fac. lun.* 943^{c}.

[230] *Ibid.*, 942^{f}, 943^{c}-944^{c}. Cicero *Tus. Dis.* 1.18. 42-43; 22.51 and Plutarch *De fac. lun.* 943^{d} for the idea that the soul arises to the ether by virtue of its sharing the same nature with the ether.

[231] *De fac. lun.* 943^{b}, 944^{e-f}.

[232] *De sera num.* 564^{b}.

In conclusion, the history of Greek eschatological thought has been traced in its main lines from the Homeric religion to the Roman Period. This history was marked by two significant developments. The first was the change effected by the mysteries of the sixth century from the old concept of the shades in an undifferentiated underworld to the idea of the judgment of the dead and punishments and rewards in the underworld. In Orphism these new concepts were accompanied by the doctrine of *metensomatosis* and the final release of the soul from the cycle of rebirth. While these beliefs first formulated in the mysteries were preserved into the Roman Period, a second development took place beginning in the fifth century and continuing to the end of antiquity which taught the celestial immortality of the soul and transposed the underworld to the heavens.

---

[233] *Ibid*., 564^{f}. Cf. Proclus *in R*. ii.131.20-132.13 where the idea was also stated that the judgment was held between the earth and the moon.

[234] *De sera num*. 565^{a-b}.

[235] *Ibid*., 564^{f}, 565^{b-d}. The various punishments were described at 566^{e}-567^{e}.

[236] *Ibid*., 565^{e}-566^{a}, 567^{e}-568; cf. *De gen*. *Soc*. 591^{c}.

The Judgment of the Dead in Jewish Eschatology[237]

The Old Testament Sheol (שׁאול) was in many ways similar to the Homeric Hades. It was the subterranean dwelling place of the dead,[238] a land of darkness[239] and forgetfulness[240] to which the wise and foolish alike must go.[241] There dwelt the dead as shades (רפאים)[242] without form[243] and strength,[244] and "he who goes down to Sheol does not come up."[245] Although this pessimistic view persisted into the Hellenistic Period,[246] there appeared in the third to the second century B.C. two new concepts which radically altered the old understanding of the fate of the dead.

---

[237] To the subject in general, see Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3d ed. rev. by H. Gressmann; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), pp. 202-301. R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. (2d ed. rev.; London: A & C Black, 1913) H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitischen-jüdischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905). D. S. Russell, *The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 263ff., 353ff; P. Voltz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).

The first of the new ideas was the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment. Already in the apocalyptic section of Isaiah (24-27), the idea of the future resurrection was expressed: "Thy dead shall live, their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy! For thy dew is a dew of light, and on the land of the shades thou wilt let it fall" (26.19). In Dan. 12.2 the doctrine of the resurrection occurred together with the idea of punishment and reward: "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The distinction made here between those who would receive life and those who would receive shame and contempt implied an act of judgment, and in Dan. 7.9-10 the eschatological judgment was described. The Ancient of Days took his seat upon the throne of judgment in the presence of his angelic retinue, and "the court sat in judgment, and the books were opened." In I En. 22.4, 13 the resurrection and judgment were mentioned together, and in I En. 90.20 the throne of judgment was erected in Jerusalem, and they "took the sealed books and opened those books before the Lord of the sheep."

---

[238] Num. 16.30-33; Dt. 32.22; Ps. 88.3-7; Isa. 14. 9-11.

[239] Ps. 49.19; 88.6, 12; Isa. 59.9-10.

[240] Ps. 88.12.

[241] Ps. 49.10, 12, 20; 89.47-48.

[242] Ps. 88.11; Isa. 14.9.

[243] Ps. 49.14.

[244] Ps. 88.4; Isa. 14.10; 59.10.

[245] Job. 7.9; cf. Ps. 49.19; Hos. 13.14.

[246] E.g. Sir. 14.16-17; 17.27-28; 41.4.

Although one frequently read of the scales of judgment,[247] it was more often the books referred to in the above quotations which provided the basis for judgment. These judgment books had their origin in the Old Testament figure of the books by which divine justice was maintained. On the one hand there was the register containing the names of the righteous or the living.[248] As a metaphor for divine punishment, especially the punishment of death, one could speak of God's striking the name of the offender from that book.[249] On the other hand, there was the record of one's deeds to which appeal could be made for earthly punishment or reward.[250] When, therefore, the moment of reckoning was shifted to the Last Judgment in Jewish Apocalyptic, it was natural that these heavenly books should continue to provide the basis for judgment.[251] In the judgment scene of the New Testament Apocalypse, both books appeared. On the one hand, "the dead were judged by what was written in the books, by what they had done," and on the other hand, "if any one's name was not found written in the book of life, he was thrown into the lake of fire."[252]

---

[247] Job 31.6; Prov. 16.2; Dan. 5.27; I En. 41.1; 61.8; II En. 44.5; 49.2; 52.15; II Bar. 41.6.

In addition to the doctrine of the resurrection and the Last Judgment, the Old Testament understanding of the fate of the dead in Sheol was also modified by a second idea according to which recompense was received immediately after death. Just as Hades was divided among the righteous and the wicked in the teachings of the Greek mysteries, so Sheol was divided in Jewish Apocalyptic. Hence in I En. 22 the abode of the dead was divided into three (or four) discrete areas among which one was reserved for the righteous with a "bright spring of water" and another was a place of punishment for the wicked. So also in I En. 103.3-8 the righteous received life and joy after death, but the sinner descended into Sheol for torture and judgment. In this latter text, however, the abode of the righteous dead appeared no longer to have been situated in Sheol. In the similitudes of Enoch such was clearly the case, for the souls of the righteous elect were found not in Sheol but in "the Garden of the Righteous."

---

[248] Ex. 32.32-33; Ps. 69.28; 139.16; Isa. 4.3; Mal. 3.16-18.

[249] Ex. 32.32-33; Ps. 69.28; Isa. 4.3.

[250] Ps. 56.8; Isa. 65.6; Mal. 3.16.

[251] Dan. 7.10; I En. 81.4; 89.61-77; 90.17, 20; 97.6; 98.7-8; 104. 7; 108.7; II En. 50.1; 52.15; 53.2; II Bar. 24.1; IV Ezr. 6.20.

[252] Rev. 20.12-15.

At this point one encounters still another development which paralleled the evolution of Greek eschatology, namely the transposition of the abode of the dead to the heavens. For according to I En. 39.5-8 the righteous elect souls dwelt with God and the angels, and in I En. 60.8,23 the old mythical paradise, now styled "the Garden of the Righteous," was situated in the heavens. When in later texts an attempt was made to specify more definitely where paradise was located in the heavens two different schemata were employed. That is to say, two different cosmographies were employed, one which divided the heavenly world into three heavens and one which distinguished seven heavens corresponding to the seven planets, i.e. the five planets plus the sun and moon. Depending upon which cosmography was employed, paradise was located either in the third or the seventh heaven but in either case in the highest heaven. Hence, in the original text of T. Levi 2.7-5.1 the heavenly temple was located in the third heaven as was paradise in II Cor. 12.2-3. On the other hand, in I En. 24-25 the paradise garden with the Tree of Life and the throne of God was situated on the seventh and highest mountain = heaven as was the abode of the righteous in Asc. Isa. 9.7. While the abode of the righteous was thus elevated to the heavens in this development, Sheol apparently remained beneath the earth as the place of punishment for sinners. In this case, one would have a situation exactly analogous to that in Plato where the Islands of the Blessed were transposed to the heavens while Tartarus remained below the earth as the dwelling place of the sinners.

Finally, however, one also finds in Jewish Apocalyptic as in late Greek eschatology the transposal of the place of punishment to the heavens. In II En. 8.1-10.6 both paradise and the place of punishment were located in the third heaven, and in III Bar. 4-5 Hades in the form of the dragon who tempted Adam and devoured the wicked was located in the third heaven.[253] In the case of II Enoch, however, there were seven heavens, and although the text of III Baruch breaks off after the fifth heaven there were probably not five but seven heavens in the original text. Hence, one has to do here with a tradition in which paradise and Sheol were located not in the highest but in the third of seven heavens. This means that the location of paradise in the third heaven according to the three-fold cosmography was carried over and applied to a seven-fold cosmography. The reason this was done was because in II Enoch and III Baruch the place of punishment was located adjacent to paradise in the same heaven. Put another way, Sheol divided into paradise and hell was transposed into the heavens. Instead of locating this divided Sheol in the highest heaven where God dwelt, however, it was considered more appropriate to place it in the third heaven where paradise alone had been located in the older three-fold schema and to elevate God's throne to the seventh heaven according to the seven-fold cosmography. In this manner the dwelling of God and the angels was sufficiently separated from the divided Sheol in the heavens.

---

[253] See also II En. 40.12ff. where hell was seen already filled with the wicked dead.

It may be concluded, therefore, that in Jewish Apocalyptic one finds a development entirely parallel to that witnessed in Greek eschatology: (1) the division of an originally undivided underworld into separate areas of punishment and reward and (2) the transposal of the underworld to the heavens. However, unlike the Greeks, Jewish Apocalyptic also taught a cosmic eschatology which involved the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment, and as a result of the combination of the individual and the cosmic eschatologies there appeared in Jewish Apocalyptic the idea of the intermediate state, that is, the belief that between death and the final resurrection the souls of the righteous and wicked were placed in a temporary paradise and hell.[254] It was this dual eschatology that was characteristic of Jewish Apocalyptic, and this means that although one can demonstrate a parallel development in the Greek and Apocalyptic eschatology of the individual it was not Greek but Iranian eschatology that exerted the dominant influence upon Apocalyptic. For it was from the Iranian religion that the dual eschatology derived.

In addition to the idea that the dead were recompensed at once in paradise or hell, it should also be pointed out that in Jewish Apocalyptic as in Iranian religion one also finds the idea that the righteous and wicked souls were led away at death by either a comforting or punishing angel.[255] Hence, in the T. Asher 6.4-6:

---

[254] I En. 22.13; 100.5; II Bar. 21.23; 30.2-5; 36.11; 59.10; IV Ezr. 4.35,41; 7.32, 95, 101; I Th. 4.13-15; Lk. 16.19-31; II Pet. 2.4-10

> Because the ends [τέλη] of men show their righteousness, and they are made known to the angels of the Lord and of Beliar. For when the soul which is evil departs, it is tormented by the evil spirit which also it served in lusts and evil works. But if he is peaceful, with joy he knows the angel of peace, and he leads him into eternal life.[256]

As for the idea of a post-mortem judgment, there were only a few allusions in spite of the fact that the separation of the sinners and the wicked presupposed some form of judgment.[257] It was not until the Testament of Abraham that the myth of the judgment of souls after death was documented, and here it was clear that the concept of the post-mortem judgment was secondary in Jewish eschatology.[258] According to this myth, not the comforting or punishing angels of T. Asher 6.4-6 but the death angel removed the soul from the body and led it to the place of judgment (T. Abra. 9.10-11). The place of judgment was located in the heavenly paradise (T. Abra. 10.2), and the judge was not God but Abel and the prosecutor was Enoch (11.2-3). That this myth was created on the model of the Last Judgment was clear from the fact that the basis for judgment was provided by two books (10.7-16), namely the Book of Life and the record of deeds which also appeared as the basis for judgment in the myth of the Last Judgment. In short, when a myth of the post-mortem judgment was finally composed, its most distinctive feature was the books of judgment which were borrowed from the myth of the Last Judgment and ultimately from the Old Testament.

---

[255] See above, pp. 39-40.

[256] Here and elsewhere the Greek text for the T. Twelve Patriarchs was that of R. H. Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Reprint of Oxford ed. 1908; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960).

[257] At I En. 103.8 judgment was mentioned twice and at Wisdom 4.20 the reckoning of sins was mentioned, but in neither place was it clear that a post-mortem judgment was intended. Cf. also IV Ezr. 8.39-40.

---

[258] Ed. of both recensions of the Greek text by M. R. James, The Testament of Abraham (Cambridge: Clarendon Press, 1892). German tr. by Paul Riessler, Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel (Reprint of 2d. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), pp. 1091-1103. Against the Christian origin of this document maintained by James, p. 50, see the convincing argument for its Jewish origin and character by K. Kohler, "The Pre-Talmudic Haggadah," Jewish Quarterly Review, VII (1895), 581-606. A related document entitled The Apocalypse of Abraham was edited from the Roumanian version and translated into English by M. Gaster, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, IX.1 (1887), 1-32; reprinted by Gaster, Studies and Texts (London: Maggs Bros., 1925-28), Vol. I, pp. 92-123, esp. p. 112 for the judgment book. For another late Jewish apocalypse which contained the book of judgment, see Apoc. Sophonias 4.11.

At the end of this study it may be concluded that in Egyptian, Iranian, Greek, and Jewish Apocalyptic thought alike there was found the idea of the post-mortem ascent and judgment of the soul. For the investigation of the background of the Apocalypse of Paul in the history of religions, this leads to the further conclusion that the general idea of the ascent and judgment of the soul in the Apocalypse *could* have derived from either of these traditions. On the other hand, each of the eschatologies studied have their own peculiarities, and it is these peculiarities of the various traditions which provide the possibility of ascertaining the background of the Apocalypse of Paul. That is to say, by comparing individual aspects of the eschatology of the Apocalypse with the peculiarities of the various traditions studied, it should now be possible to arrive at some understanding of the background and milieu of the Apocalypse.

CHAPTER III

THE JUDGMENT AND PUNISHMENT OF SOULS

In the description of the judgment and punishment of souls in the fourth and fifth heavens (20.5-22-10), copious material was provided for ascertaining the traditions employed by the Apocalypse of Paul. The scene in the fourth heaven began when a soul was brought out from "the land of the dead" and placed at the gate of the fourth heaven by certain godlike angels who then proceeded to "flog" (μαστιγοῦν) it (20.5-12). Similarly, in the fifth heaven (22.2-10), there was a "great angel" holding an iron staff with three other angels holding "flails" (μάστιξ) with which they goaded souls to judgment. In both instances, one has to do with the punishing angels. That they were the Erinyes[259] of Greek tradition was indicated not only by the fact that the punishing angels employed "flails," the traditional instrument of punishment used by the Erinyes,[260] but also by the fact that the number of punishing angels in the fifth heaven was specified as three (22.5), the traditional number of Erinyes.[261] Beyond this, however, the punishing angels were identified with the Erinyes etymologically. For the statement that the punishing angels of the fifth heaven "were striving (ἐρίζειν) with each other" (22.7-8) identified them with the Erinyes as the strife angels (Ἐρινύς ἐρίζειν). In the presence of the Erinyes, the figure of the "great angel" holding the iron staff as the symbol of authority and rule should accordingly be identified with the ruler over punishments, who was called Tartaruchus and Temeluchus in the Visio sancti Pauli (chaps. 18 and 34).[262] In the punishing angels of the fourth and fifth heavens, therefore, the Apocalypse of Paul was clearly dependent upon the Greek tradition. That the punishment took place in the heavens rather than in the underworld did not militate against the Greek background, for this transfer of the underworld to the heavens had already taken place within the Greek tradition in the Hellenistic-Roman Period.[263]

---

[259] On the Erinys as originally the self-avenging soul of the slain and later the avenging spirit(s) of the underworld, see Rohde, pp. 178-79; Nilsson, I, 100f. For the Erinyes in other Gnostic texts, see Mani. Ps., p. 84. 21f. and below n. 268.

---

[260] Dieterich, Nekyia, p. 58f.

[261] Rohde, p. 178, n. 158.

[262] In Visio sancti Pauli 18, the Gr. reads "Tartaruchus;" the Lat., "Tartarus;" and the Coptic, "Temeluchus." In chap. 34, the Gr. has "Temeluchus" and the Coptic "Aftemeloukhos." Cf. II En. 37.1 "B".

In addition to the Erinyes of the Greek tradition, however, there was also evidence that the figure of the punishing angels in the Apocalypse was influenced from another direction. For in addition to their role as the punishers of the soul, the punishing angels of the Apocalypse were also the psychopomps who came to the soul at death and led it forth to judgment. With regard to the punishing angels of the fourth heaven, Böhlig translated: "Ich sah aber (δέ) die Engel (ἄγγελος), wie sie Gott glichen, indem die Engel (ἄγγελος) eine Seele (ψυχή) aus dem Lande der Toten [nahmen]" (20.6-10). There was a problem here, however, for Böhlig's term "nehmen" presupposed a Coptic term in the lacuna at 20.8 which was different from that which he actually used to restore the lacuna. In his transcription of the text, Böhlig restored the lacuna with the term "C[OB]TE," which does not mean "nehmen," as in his translation, but "bereiten," "to prepare," as in his index of Coptic terms.[264] What is more important is that this restoration was almost certainly impossible.

---

[263] See above, pp. 54-63.

[264] Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . . , p. 122.

The lacuna at 20.8 may be described in three points. First, there was a hole in the papyrus which required at least three characters to fill. Secondly, the character which immediately preceeded the lacuna was uncertain. It had, however, the characteristic size and shape of the "E" rather than the "C" in the scribal hand, and a vestige of the cross stroke which distinguished the "E" from the "C", was still discernible.[265] In the third place, the character immediately following the lacuna at 20.8 was also uncertain as Böhlig's sublinear point, "T", indicated. No trace of the cross stroke of the "T" was present, and the character could as easily have been an "N". To summarize, the character immediately preceeding the lacuna was more likely an "E" than a "C", the lacuna in the papyrus required at least three characters, and the character immediately following the lacuna was uncertain. Negatively, this means that Böhlig's "C[ŌB̲]TE" cannot be accepted as an adequate restoration because: (1) the first character was more likely an "E" than a "C" and (2) the two characters "OB" were not sufficient to fill the lacuna.

---

[265] The "E" was characteristically a full millimeter higher and more open than the "C". The difference between the two characters can be easily appreciated from the difference between the character before the lacuna and the character which preceeded the character in question. For here there was the characteristically smaller "C" followed immediately by the much larger and more open character before the lacuna. That this character was most likely an "E" with the cross stroke all but missing can be further substantiated by comparing it with the last character on line 24.3 which was also an "E" with the cross stroke missing.

Positively, one has to begin anew with the following situation: E⌊. . .⌉.E. What was required, therefore, was an expression of six characters beginning and ending with an "E". From the context one would expect to find in the lacuna a word like Böhlig's "nehmen," 'to take,' or the verb "to bring." By using the verb "EINE," 'to bring,' in the third person plural of the present circumstantial,[266] one could thus both fill the lacuna and satisfy the contextual requirements: E⌊ΥΕΙ⌉ΝΕ, "when they brought." Thus reconstructed, 20.6b-10a would read: ⲁⲓ̈/ⲛⲁⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲛⲓⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ/ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲓⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉ⌊ⲩⲉⲓ⌉ⲛⲉ / ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϩⲙ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲛⲧⲉ / ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ, , "I saw then the godlike angels (ἄγγελος) who ⌊were bring⌉ing out a soul (ψυχή) from the land of the dead."

Although this reconstruction of the lacuna in 20.8 was fairly certain, it remained a restoration, and for this reason it could not be used as a basis for argument. However, from the context it was clear that the godlike angels of the fourth heaven did something with regard to a soul from out of the land of the dead and placed it at the gate of the fourth heaven. As Böhlig's translation "nahmen" indicated, the general idea demanded by the context was that the angels took, brought, seized, or led a soul out from the land of the dead, and the above restoration demonstrated that the lacuna could be restored to agree with that contextual demand. From the context alone, therefore, it could be seen that the angels who punished the soul in the fourth heaven were also the psychopomps of that soul. Then with regard to the punishing angels of the fifth heaven, they too were depicted as psychopomps for they were those who goaded the souls, i.e. drove them, to judgment (22.9-10). In conclusion, the punishing angels of the fourth and fifth heavens in the Apocalypse of Paul combined the punishing office of the Erinyes with that of the psychopomp.

---

[266] W. C. Till, Koptische Grammatik (2d ed. rev.; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961), sec. 329, pp. 168-69.

One finds this same combination of the role of the Erinyes and the psychopomp in the Pistis Sophia in a group of demonic beings called the ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες . The term ἐριναῖοι was almost certainly a corruption of 'Ερινύες, and the title ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες should probably be translated "the Erinyes Receivers."[267]

---

[267] Against Till, *Pistis Sophia . . .*, p. 145, note, who suggested emending ἐριναῖοι to read εἰρηναῖοι , "friedlich." G.R.S. Mead, *Pistis Sophia* (2d. rev.; London: John M. Watkins, 1921), p. 189, translated ἐριναῖοι as "retributive," thus apparently also sensing the derivation from 'Ερινύες.

Of these Erinyes Receivers it was said:

> Jetzt nun (οὖν), wenn die Zeit jenes Menschen vollendet ist, so kommt zuerst das Verhängnis (μοῖρα)heraus und führt (ἄγειν) den Menschen zum Tode . . . . Und darnach kommen die ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες und führen jene Seele (ψυχή) aus dem Körper (σῶμα), und darnach bringen die ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες drei Tage zu, indem sie mit jener Seele (ψυχή) in allen Örtern (τόποι) herumkreisen und sie zu allen Aeonen (αἰῶνες) der Welt (κόσμος) schicken. . . . Und nach drei Tagen führen die ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες jene Seele (ψυχή) hinab zur Amente des Chaos (χάος) . . . .[268]

The Erinyes Receivers were, in short, the psychopomps who came to the soul at death and led it forth into the heavens as a form of preliminary punishment before bringing it to the Amente of Chaos.[269] While thus further attesting the Gnostic identification of the role of the Erinyes with that of the demon psychopomps, the text from the Pistis Sophia also attested the ultimate source of the role of the demon psychopomps. Before raising this point, however, it must first be demonstrated that the motif of the demon psychopomps occurred elsewhere in Gnostic sources apart from any reference to the Erinyes.

The demon psychopomps occurred in the Mandean hymns as "the seven godlike appearances" who came to claim what was theirs from the soul after it had been set free from the body by the death angel Sauriel.[270] In the Manichean sources they were those concerning whom one prayed at the moment of death: "My Lord, as I call unto thee in the hour for which I [. . .], and do thou scare away the [. . .] that they seize not my soul (ψυχή) . . . ."[271] Those who would be scared away were the "seven fearful demons" who were filled with "grief (λύπη) and sorrow" when they were not able to "trap" the departed soul of the righteous in their "nets of lust" (ἡδονή).[272] They were the "demons" (δαίμων) and the "robbers" (λῃστής),[273] "the hunters of death" who "catch the birds," i.e. the departed souls, and "break (?) their wings that they may not fly to their dovecotes."[274] Finally, the nature and character of the demon psychopomps in Gnosticism was made entirely clear in the Ophite teaching which identified them with the seven ἀρχοντικοὶ ἄγγελοι.[275] In fine, they were the seven planetary archons, or their angels, who came to the soul at death to seize it and prevent its escape to the light world.

---

[268] Pistis Sophia 111 (Till, p. 184.4-16).

[269] For this idea of punishment by being transported through the atmosphere, see above,p.161, n.228. See also Pistis Sophia 111, (Till, p. 183.15-17) where the ἐριναῖοι παραλήμπτορες assigned subordinate demons to watch the souls and record their sins so that they could punish them in the judgments.

---

[270] Qol., 49 (*M. Lit.*, pp. 80-84= *C. Prayerbook*, pp. 43-46); 67 (*M. Lit.*, pp. 97-99= *C. Prayerbook*, pp. 53-54). On the identity of the Mandean Sauriel with the death angel Suriel in Judaism, see Lidzbarski's note in *Johannesbuch*, p. 119, n.3. For the later development of Sowrill (= Sauriel) as a "spirit of darkness" who seized the soul, see E. S. Drower, *The Mandeans of Iraq and Iran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 197.

[271] *Mani*. *ps*., p. 87.7-9.

[272] *Mani*. *Ps*., p. 103.29-33. See also n.274 below. For the Egyptian figure of nets and the catching of the "birds of passage," see Zandee, p. 243.

[273] Zandee, p. 243, noted the figure of the demon robbers who threatened the soul in the underworld in the Egyptian religion.

However, the concept of the demon psychopomps was older than their identification with the seven archons in Gnosticism, and the ultimate source of that concept was evidenced in the Ophite teaching referred to above. For there the demon psychopomps were mentioned in the context of a death scene in which the dying was attended not only by the archontic angels but also by the angels of light.[276] This scene unmistakably derived from the Iranian religion where the dying was thought to be accompanied by the righteous Srōsh and his associates on the one hand and by the demon Vizarsh and his company on the other.[277] Similarly, the text quoted above from the Pistis Sophia alluded to the death scene in the Iranian religion.[278] For the three days in which the soul was said to have been in the custody of "the Erinyes Receivers" was a reflection of the three days after death when in the Iranian religion the soul of the wicked was threatened and finally led away by the demon Vizarsh and his company. It may now be said that the motif of the demon psychopomps derived ultimately from the Iranian religion. Where, therefore, as in the Apocalypse of Paul and the Pistis Sophia, the role of the Erinyes was combined with the role of the demon psychopomps, one has an instance of the syncretistic tendency of Gnosticism in which a mythologumenon of one tradition was superimposed upon that of another. It should be pointed out, however, that Gnosticism could have received the Iranian concept of the demon psychopomps through the medium of Jewish Apocalyptic. For as evidenced by T. Asher 6.4-6, the concept of the psychopomps who meet the soul at death was already taken over by Jewish Apocalyptic. At death the souls met "the angels of the Lord and Satan." When the wicked departs, βασανίζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος ...., but the righteous soul meets τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ειρήνης, καὶ εισφέρει αὐτὸν εις ζωὴν αἰώνιον.[279] Hence, although the author of the Apocalypse seems to have himself identified the punishing angels with the Erinyes by the etymology from ἐρίζειν , this identification could have been accomplished within the sphere of Jewish Apocalyptic where the idea of the punishing-psychopomp was already entertained.

---

[274] *Mani*. *Ps*., p. 182.1-10.

[275] Celsus in Origen, *c*. *Celsum*, vi.27.

[276] *Ibid*. See also the holy and evil angels who attended the soul at death in the *Visio sancti Pauli* 15.

[277] See above, pp. 39-40.

---

[278] See above, p. 81.

[279] I am indebted to Prof. W. Brownlee for the ref. to "the Angels of affliction" at IQS, iv.12.

Having thus traced the punishing-psychopomps of the Apocalypse of Paul to the Greek Erinyes and the Iranian demon psychopomps and pointed out the possibility that the combination of these two figures in the Apocalypse could have already taken place in Jewish Apocalyptic, attention may now be given to the remainder of the scene in the fourth heaven. In response to the flogging which it received at the gate of the fourth heaven from the hands of the punishing-psychopomps, the soul protested by asking what sin it had committed to deserve such punishment. To this the τελώνης of the fourth heaven answered by referring to the many sins which the soul had committed in "the land of the dead" (20.13-20). In response to this indictment, the soul demanded witnesses, and a trial ensued, presumably before the τελώνης (20.25).

Before turning to the judgment scene proper, the background of the concept of the heavenly gates, the τελώνης , and the expression "land of the dead" must first be examined. To begin with, the idea was widespread in antiquity that the city of the dead was protected like earthly cities by a gate and a gatekeeper. One need only recall the many-headed dog, Cerberus, who guarded the gate to Hades in the Greek tradition,[280] the guards of "the seven gates of the nether world" through which Inanna descended in the Sumerian myth,[281] and the twelve gates of the underworld in the Egyptian Book of Gates.[282] With regard to heavenly gates, the concept of the twelve stations of the zodiac as the twelve gates of heaven through which the sun ascended and descended was already taught in the Babylonian Creation Epic.[283] The heavenly portals of the sun were also known to the ancient Egyptians, and these were most probably the gates guarded by demon keepers through which the ascending soul had to pass on its journey to the celestial paradise.[284] Similarly, the two χάσματα in the heaven through which souls ascended and descended in Plato's myth were probably the portals of the sun.[285] A further development of the concept of the ascent of the soul through the gate of the sun was found in Heraclides Ponticus who identified the gates of ascent with the stations of the zodiac.[286] Although the concept of the ascent of the soul through the gates of the sun, i.e. the signs of the zodiac, helps to clarify the background of the Apocalypse of Paul, it was not this idea that one finds expressed there in the figure of the heavenly gates.

---

[280] Hesiod *Th*. 310ff.; Virgil *Aen*. vi.417ff. For the idea in Lucian of Samosata, see Betz, pp. 82, 92.

[281] See the translation of "Inanna's Descent to the Nether World" by S. N. Kramer in *ANET*, pp. 52-57, esp. lines 74-80, 120ff. Cf. the later Babylonian version of the myth, "The Descent of Ishtar to the Nether World," *ANET*, pp. 106-109.

[282] See above, pp. 27-28.

[283] See the translation by E. A. Speiser in *ANET*, pp. 60-72, esp. "Tablet V," lines 1-10, p. 67. For the gates of the underworld in Jewish Apocalyptic, see II En. 42.1. In the New Testament, Mt. 16.18.

[284] See above, p.27, n.101, and Kees, pp. 429ff., 443ff.

In the Apocalypse of Paul the heavenly gates were associated not with the sun stations of the zodiac but with the heavens through which the apostle ascended. Since the first two heavens were not mentioned at all and the apostle was taken at once from the third to the fourth heaven nothing was said about the gates of the first three heavens.[287] From the fourth to the seventh, however, each of the heavens had gates which opened to the apostle,[288] and the seventh heaven itself, perhaps here regarded as the firmament above the seventh heaven, rather than the gate to the eighth heaven opened to the apostle.[289] Then from the eighth to the tenth heaven the motif of the gates no longer appeared.[290] In short, each of the heavens from the fourth to the seventh had gates, and the firmament above the seventh heaven opened to allow passage to the eighth heaven. By allowing for the probability that the gates to the first three heavens were not mentioned simply because those heavens were passed over by the narrative,[291] one would have a situation in the Apocalypse with regard to the gates which was entirely parallel to the Mithraic "ladder with seven gates and at its top an eighth gate."[292] As Celsus explained, the Mithraic ladder symbolized the gates of the seven planetary spheres, i.e. the five planets plus the sun and moon, through which the soul ascended to the eighth sphere, the realm of the fixed stars.[293]

---

[285] Plato _R._ x.614^{c,d}. See above, pp. 49-50.

[286] See above, p. 56f.

[287] 19.20-25.

[288] 20.10, 21.27, 22.12, 22.24.

Regardless of what one considers its ultimate origin to have been,[294] the idea of the ascension through the seven gates of the planetary spheres was known and employed in Jewish Apocalyptic. The concept of the seven heavens surmounted by the heavenly temple was already known to Jewish Apocalyptic in the mid-second century B.C. (I En. 24-25).[295] When, therefore, the older motif of the ascension vision[296] was adjusted to the concept of the seven heavens, there appeared in the first century A.D. the motif of the ascension through the seven heavens (II En. 3-22).[297] Correspondingly, when the older idea of the ascension through the door of heaven was adjusted to the seven-fold cosmography,[298] there appeared in the second century A.D. the motif of the gates in the seven heavens through which the prophet ascended (III Baruch).[299] What this evidence demonstrates is that the concept of the ascension through the gates of the heavens in the Apocalypse of Paul could have derived directly from Jewish Apocalyptic. Since, moreover, the Apocalypse was an ascension vision like those of Jewish Apocalyptic in which the ascent of the prophet was narrated, it is also probable that it followed the Apocalyptic model.[300]

---

[289] 23.29-30.

[290] 24.1-9.

[291] See above, n. 287.

[292] Celsus in Origen, _c_. _Celsum_, vi.22.

[293] _Ibid_. To this, see F. Cumont, _The Mysteries of Mithra_, trans. T. J. McCormack (From the 2d Fr. ed. rev; New York: Dover Publications, 1956), pp. 143-45.

---

[294] W. Bousset, "Die Himmelreise der Seele," pp. 248-49 and F. Cumont, After Life in Roman Paganism, pp. 106-108, attributed the idea of the ascent of the soul through the seven planetary spheres to Iranian-Babylonian syncretism.

[295] The range of seven fiery mountains represented the seven heavens with the seventh and highest mountain symbolizing the seventh heaven. Cf. Bousset, "Die Himmelreise der Seele," pp. 243-44, where it was shown that the seven world-periods of I En. 52 already presupposed the concept of the seven heavens.

[296] E.g. Ezek. 40 ff., I En. 14; T. Levi 2.5-5.2.

[297] See also the redaction of T. Levi 2.5-5.2; the ascent of the soul through "seven orders" in IV Ezr. 7.88-101; and the ascent through seven heavens in Asc. Isa. 7-9.

[298] Rev. 4.1.

If one was thus able to demonstrate the possibility and indeed the probability that the idea of the gates of the heavens in the Apocalypse derived from Jewish Apocalyptic, the situation was otherwise with regard to the gatekeepers. In the Apocalypse the figure who guarded the gates of the fourth and sixth heavens was called τελώνης, 'tax collector,' 'customs official,' or 'toll collector.' What one has, therefore, in the telōnēs was a heavenly being who was stationed at the gates of the various heavens to interrupt passage and demand tribute. Recalling the familiar obol for Charon,[301] one might conjecture that the idea of tolls for the heavenly journey of the soul derived from the Greek sphere of influence. Hence, Wendland may have been correct in attributing the figure of the *telōnēs* to "späteren griechischen Volksglauben."[302] However, in no text known to the present writer was the *telōnēs* actually described demanding and receiving passage money. If indeed the idea of exacting passage money was ever attached to the role of the *telōnēs*, it was a secondary development.

---

[299] III (Gr.) Bar. 2.2., 5; 3.1; 11.1, 5; 14.1; 15.1; 17.1. See also the heavenly gates of Asc. Isa. 10.24-27.

[300] See below, pp. 168ff.

[301] Aristophanes Ra. 135ff.; Lucian Cat. 21; Luct. 10. See Radermacher, pp. 90ff. and Betz, p. 82f.

Originally the role of the *telōnēs* was that of the rulers of the various heavens. Hence, in some texts the guard of a particular heavenly gate was still called the ἄρχων πύλης.[303] The term *telōnēs* was thus only a functional name for the rulers as the collectors of tributes. The tribute exacted was not passage money, however, but either that part of the soul which belonged by nature to the *archōn-telōnēs* or the soul itself which belonged to him by virtue of the manner of life which it had lived.[304] The *telōnai* "not only extort a tribute (τέλος) but forcibly (στερησίμως) take away also the souls (ψυχή)."[305] In short, the *telōnai* of the Apocalypse of Paul were the archons of Gnosticism, the planetary deities who governed the world through their *heimarmēnē* and prevented the escape of souls to the light kingdom by blocking their passage through the heavenly gates.[306] Ultimately, however, the archons of Gnosticism and, therefore, also the *telōnēs* of the Apocalypse of Paul derived from the seven planetary deities of Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology.

---

[302] Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr /Paul Siebeck/, 1907), p. 167. This view was already projected by W. Kroll, "Die chaldäischen Orakel," *Rheinisches Museum*, n.F. Jg. 50 (1895), pp. 636-40, esp. 637, n.4; reprinted as pp. 79-83 in Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis* (reprint of the 1st ed. in "Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen;" VII.1 in Breslau, 1894; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962). Prof. W. Brownlee has called my attention to Etruscan grave statues with the outstretched hand containing a coin.

[303] E.g. the archons of the heavenly gates according to the Ophite diagram described by Origen, *c. Celsum*, vi.31.

To summarize, with regard to the gates of the heavens through which the Apostle ascended in the Apocalypse of Paul, it has been shown that the possible and indeed probable immediate background was the ascension visions of Jewish Apocalyptic. With regard to the guardians of the heavenly gates, the *telōnai*, the ultimate background was Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology while the immediate background was Gnosticism. To this extent, therefore, one has the situation in which the Jewish Apocalyptic ascension through the heavenly spheres was combined with the Gnostic demonization of those heavenly spheres. As it shall now be demonstrated, the same background and reinterpretation of the tradition of Jewish Apocalyptic lay behind the concept of "the land of the dead."

---

[304] On the soul constituted by the elements of the seven planetary spheres collected by the spirit on its descent and returned on its ascent, see *Poimandres* 25 (N. F. I.15-16) and the discussion of "Die Planetenseele" by Hans Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* I (3d ed. rev.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 181-85. Cf. the idea that the soul was deposited with the moon from which it derived while the *nous* ascended on to the sun from which it derived already in Plutarch *De fac. lun.* 943^{2-c}, 944^{e-f}. See above,pp.61-62.

[305] I Ap. James (CG V, 33.5-11).

[306] For other references to the *telōnēs* in Gnostic literature, see, e.g., Acts of Thomas 148 (L.B., p. 257. 11); 167 (L.B., p. 281.10); *Mani. Ps.*, pp. 97.10; 192.19; 218.4f.; and the "Zöllner" of Ginza L., I.2, p. 433.11f.

The expression "land of the dead" at 20.9-10 should not be understood as referring to a subterranean Hades. For it had to do with "the cosmos (κόσμος) of the dead," i.e. with this present world where "deeds of lawlessness" (ἀνομία) were committed (20.17-20), where murder was committed in the daytime (21.5-9), and sins were completed under cover of night (21.11-14). In short, it had to do with existence in the "body" (σῶμα) (20.29), with the cosmos (21.4-5) which, by being designated "cosmos of the dead" (20.19-20), was thereby identified with Hades. With this should be compared the Gehenna-Tartarus of the Ophites[307] and "the depth of Amente" or the "kingdom of death" in the Apocryphon of John.[308] For in the latter, "the depth of Amente" was said to be ruled over by Belias= Belial or Beliar, who was known as the chief of the evil spirits in Jewish Apocalyptic.[309] What one had to do with here was the myth of the fall of Satan. According to II En. 29.5, the devil was one of the angels who was cast "from the heights with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless." He was "the evil spirit of the lower places..." who in spite of his fall kept "his intelligence as far as his understanding of righteousness and sinful things" (31.4-5). It was just this fallen devil of Jewish Apocalyptic whom Valentinus called Cosmocrator, in distinction from the Demiurge, and of whom he said: καὶ τὸν μὲν κοσμοκράτορα γινώσκειν τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν ὅτι πνεῦμά ἐστι τῆς πονηρίας.[310]

---

[307] Celsus in Origen, *c. Celsum*, vi.25.

---

[308] Ap. John CG III,17.19f. mentioned the five kings over "das Chaos (χάος) und (die) Unterwelt;" Ap. John BG, 41.15, "das Chaos der Unterwelt;" Ap. John CG II, 11.6, "die Tiefe der Holle." That it was the "kingdom of death" which was meant here was shown by the addition in Ap. John CG II, 11.3-4 where the twelfth power Belias was said to be the ruler of "the depth of Amente." On this translation and its meaning, see Søren Giversen, *Apocryphon Johannis* (Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1963), Pl.59.3f., p. 67 and commentary pp. 207, 209. See also Ap. John CG II, 30.15-31.28 where the world into which the redeemer came was called Amente, the Egyptian Hades.

[309] On Belias and Belial in Jewish Apocalyptic, see R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (reprint of 1st ed. 1913; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), Vol. II, "Index," *s.v.* "Beliar," "Belial." On Belial=Beliar as originally a god of the underworld, see Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, pp. 334-35.

If the devil had been previously designated the prince of the underworld, he was already called "the ruler of this world" in the Martyrdom of Isaiah (2.4).[311] Hence, when Valentinus called him the Cosmocrator and located him not in the underworld but ἐν τῷ καθ'ἡμᾶς κόσμῳ , he was only continuing a tendency already present in Jewish Apocalyptic and the New Testament.[312] It was just this identification of the earth and sublunar region as the realm of Satan that was intended in the Gehenna-Tartarus of the Ophites, the "depth of Amente" ruled over by Belias in the Apocryphon of John, and the identification of this world with "the land of the dead" in the Apocalypse of Paul.[313] Once again, therefore, one has to do with a mixture of Jewish Apocalyptic and Gnostic motifs. Only in this case it was a matter of the transposition of Apocalyptic dualism into the radical mode of Gnostic cosmic fatalism. For to designate this world "the land of the dead" was simply another way of expressing the Gnostic pessimism towards life on earth that one finds, for instance, in the _Exc_. _ex_ _Theodoto_ (80.1): ὃν γεννᾷ ἡ μήτηρ, εἰς θάνατον ἄγεται καὶ εἰς κόσμον . . . .

---

[310] Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*., I.v.4 (H. I, 48). To the question raised by Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 193, regarding the privilege of gnosis afforded the devil here, it may now be said that this incompatible element was a part of the tradition inherited by Valentinus from Jewish Apocalyptic as II En. 31.4-5 shows. Prof. James M. Robinson informs me that the Paraphrase of Shem from Nag Hammadi also has the realm of darkness possessing *nous*.

[311] So also John 12.31; 16.11; II Cor. 4.4; I John 5.19. Cf. Eph. 2.2; 6.12

[312] Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*., I.v.4 (H. I, 48).

[313] For the identification of the earth and the sublunar realm with Hades in Plutarch, see above, n. 226.

Having thus made a preliminary foray into the history of religions problem via the expression "land of the dead" and the figure of the _telōnēs_ who guarded the gate of the fourth heaven, an examination of the judgment scene which took place before the _telōnēs_ may now be undertaken. It was demonstrated above in chapter two that the idea of the judgment of the dead was common to the Egyptian, Iranian, Greek, and Jewish Apocalyptic traditions. The task at this point was to discover which of these traditions informed the judgment scene of the Apocalypse of Paul.

R. Kasser has claimed to have found evidence of the influence of Egyptian religion in the judgment scene.[314] Instead of Böhlig's ϪⲰⲘ, 'generation,' in line 20.24, Kasser correctly read ϪⲰⲘⲈ , 'book.'[315] He mistakenly concluded, however, that a reference to the book in the judgment scene was "une allusion tout à fait explicite au 'livre des morts' de la religion égyptienne. . . ."[316] Kasser was led to this conclusion not simply by the term "book" but by what he thought was said about the book in the following line. At this point he was led astray by Böhlig's restoration of the lacuna in line 20.25 with the verb ϯ plus the preposition ϩⲓ, 'to put on.' Whereas Böhlig had in mind the idea of metempsychosis suggested by lines 22-23 and thus understood lines 24-25 as having to do with the soul's putting on a different generations (?), Kasser read "book" in line 24 and understood line 25 according to Böhlig's reconstruction in the sense of the soul's having put on the book "comme vêtement."[317] In this way the "book" took on the character of an amulet to be used by the soul against its judges in the judgment scene, and when regarded in this manner the most obvious parallel to the book was the Egyptian Book of the Dead.[318]

---

[314] _Le Muséon_, LXXVIII.1-2 (1965), p. 77.

[315] Böhlig and Labib, _Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen_ . . ., p. 22; Kasser, pp. 77, 300.

---

[316] Kasser, p. 77.

[317] Böhlig's edition and translation of 20.24-25 (Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ., p. 22) ran as follows: "[. . .]ⲱϣ ⲈⲒⲚⲈ ⲚⲚⲞⲨϪⲰⲘ Ⲉ/ [ⲦⲀⲒϮ ϩⲓ/ ⲱⲱϥ ." "[. . .] . . . . eine Generation, die / [ich ange]zogen habe." Kasser's reconstruction and translation of the same lines (pp. 77, 300) would run as follows: "[ⲁⲥⲟⲩ]ⲱϣ ⲈⲒⲚⲈ ⲚⲚⲞⲨϪⲰⲘⲈ / [ⲚⲦⲀⲨϮ ϩⲓ]ⲱⲱϥ ." "[Elle vou]lut produire un livre / [qu' on avait mis sur] lui ⟨comme vêtements⟩."

Against Kasser's interpretation, however, it should be pointed out that while there was no parallel in any judgment scene for such an appeal to the Book of the Dead there was in fact a book which played a regular and prominent role in the judgment scenes of Jewish Apocalyptic.[319] Indeed in these scenes there could be one or both of two books, the Book of Life and the book of deeds in which were inscribed respectively the names and deeds of those being judged and upon the basis of which the verdict was rendered.[320] It would appear more appropriate to begin with the assumption that the book mentioned in the Apocalypse of Paul was the judgment book of Jewish Apocalyptic and to attempt to reconstruct the lacunae in lines 24-25 in a manner appropriate to that book. If, for example, the lacuna in line 25 were restored with the verb ⲱϣ, 'to read,' Kasser's "explicit allusion to the Book of the Dead" would disappear, and in its place one would have the altogether simple idea of a book brought forward to be read. In 20.20-23, the soul responded to its indictment with an imperative ("Bring witnesses!") and then an optative ("Let them say . . . !"). The following sentence in lines 24-25 should probably be regarded as a continuation of the soul's demands and accordingly reconstructed in the conjunctive continuing the preceding optative. Thus reconstructed 20.24-25 would read: "[and be plea]

---

[318] However, even if Kasser's restoration of the text were correct, there would still not be a specific allusion to the Book of the Dead. For all that would be required would be any inscribed amulet which was worn to protect the soul against the dangers of the ascent. For example, see the amulet employed by the ascending soul in A. Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie (Leipzig-Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1910), pp. 12.15; 14.23; the Ophite amulet with the names of the seven archons in Campbell Bonner, Studies in Magical Amulets (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950), pp. 135-37 and Pl. IX, no. 188. For an amulet regarded as a writing worn like a garment, see the Samaritan phylacteries published by Moses Gaster, "Samaritan Phylacteries and Amulets," Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (March, May, June, 1915), pp. 96-107, 135,-44, 163-74, and (Feb., 1916), pp. 70ff; reprinted in Gaster, Studies and Texts (London: Maggs Bros., 1925-28), Vol. I, 387-482. For inscribed amulets of papyrus and other materials worn on the person or placed on the dead, see Bonner, pp. 2, 8 and E. A. Wallis Budge, Amulets and Talismans (reprint of ed. entitled Amulets and Superstitions; New York: University Books, 1961), pp. 132, 133, 162f. See also the Orphic gold tablets above, pp. 52-54.

[319] In the prologue to the Rudens, Plautus made reference to the idea of the record kept on tablets of the good and evil deeds of men by the stellar messengers of Jupiter. For this and older Greek notions of "das Rechenschaftsbuch des Zeus," see Nilsson, II, 186. Although this Greek idea of the heavenly record was parallel to the Old Testament idea of the ledger upon the basis of which men were rewarded and punished on earth (see above, p. 72f.), the motif of the record book was not

---

319(Contd.) carried over into the myth of the judgment of the dead in the Greek tradition. Against Betz, pp. 83, n.6, 85, none of the texts cited from Lucian of Samosata show The Book of Zeus being read in a judgment scene.

[320] See above, pp. 66ff.

sed to bring a book / ∠that they may read in7 it."[321]

Of course the above reconstruction, like every reconstructed text, is no more than a conjecture. Nevertheless, it does demonstrate on the one hand that Kasser's interpretation of the book as an amulet rested entirely upon his reconstruction of the lacunae and on the other hand that it is possible by a different reconstruction of the same lacunae to arrive at a conception of the book which was consistent with the judgment book of Jewish Apocalyptic. What has thus been demonstrated as a possibility by the reconstruction of the lacunae may now be further substantiated by a comparative analysis of the judgment scene in the Apocalypse with those in the T. Abraham (10) and the Visio sancti Pauli (17-18).

---

[321] Translating the following text: ∠ΝΓΩΥ7ΩϢ ΕΙΝΕ ΝΝΟΥΧΩΜΕ / ∠ΕΥΩϢ ϨΙ7ΩΩϤ.

T. Abraham 10	Apocalypse 20.7-21.22	Visio 17-18
T^1 Presentation of soul to judge.	A^1 Presentation of soul to judge.	V^1 Presentation of soul to judge.
T^2 Indictment.	A^2 Indictment.	V^2 Indictment.
T^3 Plea of innocence.		V^3 Plea of innocence.
T^4 Books brought.	A^3 Book and witnesses demanded by soul.	V^4 Book brought.
T^5 sins read from book.		?
	A^4 Witnesses appear.	V^5 Witnesses appear.
T^6 Sentencing.	A^5 Sentencing.	V^6 Sentencing.

The general agreement in structure and content as illustrated was sufficient to demonstrate that all three judgment scenes followed the same model. Beyond this, however, it can also be demonstrated from particular motifs that all three derived from the same tradition. To begin with, it should be pointed out that in all three scenes the soul entered a plea of innocence in response to its indictment. In the T. Abraham and the Visio the plea took the form of a direct denial of the charges (T^3, V^3) while in the Apocalypse the denial was made indirectly by the soul's presumptuous demand for witnesses and a book (A^3). The rationale for this rather unexpected motif of denying the charges was still preserved in the T. Abraham (10.15). It served to contrast the accuracy of the heavenly record overagainst man's tendency to forget his own sins.

While thus making the paraenetic point, the denial of charges also provided the opportunity to introduce the book of judgment. Again in all three judgment scenes the bringing forward of a book was mentioned in the context of the soul's protestations of innocence (T^4,A^3,V^4). In fact, the book was brought forward in direct response to the soul's declaration of innocence in the T. Abraham (T^4) and the Visio (V^4). In the Apocalypse the soul itself demanded that the book be brought forward, but precisely because it hoped thereby to establish its innocence. It would not be incorrect to say, therefore, that everything thus far led up to the introduction of the book. For the indictment of the soul was met by a denial of the charges which in turn led to the introduction of the book. What then was the nature of this book which occupied the dominant position in the judgment scene? On this there can be no doubt. In the Greek recension of the Visio (17), the book was called τὸ χειρόγραφον τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, and in the T. Abraham 10.11ff. it contained the record of sins committed by the soul being judged. Furthermore, in the T. Abraham 11.3-4 Enoch was identified as the one who recorded the deeds of men and read them from the book at the judgment. From this it was altogether certain that the book in question was the record of every man's deeds which "Enoch the Scribe" kept "until the day of condemnation" in Jewish Apocalyptic.[322] In all three of the judgment scenes, the book was the record of sins which was introduced in response to the soul's declaration of innocence in order to refute that declaration and to convict it of its sins. Therefore, both with regard to the nature and character of the book as well as the manner in which it was introduced, a common tradition lay behind the judgment scenes in the T. Abraham, the Visio, and the Apocalypse of Paul, namely the tradition of Jewish Apocalyptic.

---

[322] I En. 12.4; Jub. 4.23-24. Cf. I En. 13.10; 15.1,3; 81.6; 82.1; II En. 40.13; 53.2-3.

In distinction from the T. Abraham (T^5), neither the Visio nor the Apocalypse reported the actual reading of the book of sins. Although the angel bearing the book in the Visio offered to read the sins committed by the soul from the age of 15 and the judge asked for a report of the sins of the last five years, it was not reported that the reading took place. Instead, the attention was shifted away from the book by the angel who asked the judge to call for witnesses. At this point the Visio and the Apocalypse agreed against the T. Abraham in adding to the written testimony of the book the personal testimony of witnesses ($V5, A^4$). In fact, the witnesses displaced the book as the decisive basis for judgment in the Visio and the Apocalypse. This raises the question, therefore, as to whether or not the addition of the witnesses reflected the influence of a tradition different from that of the book, i.e. from Jewish Apocalyptic. In this case it was clear that the use of witnesses as a basis for judgment was a motif native to the Egyptian judgment scene.[323] However, if the motif of the witnesses in the *Visio* and the Apocalypse ultimately derived from the Egyptian religion, it was received through the medium of Jewish Apocalyptic.

---

[323] See above, pp. 30-31. The idea of witnesses at the judgment of the soul after death also occurred in the Mandean texts, but here they were the sacraments and the soul's deeds of piety (Ginza L. III.21, p. 543.32-33; cf. III.9, p. 521.10-17). Betz, p. 85, n.3, cited Lucian of Samosata Men. II where Lucian satirized the myth of the judgment by saying that the dead were prosecuted by their shadows which had always followed them and therefore knew all their deeds. This, of course, was Lucian's invention and not part of the Greek myth of the judgment.

For in Jewish Apocalyptic one finds the idea that the spirits of the dead called for judgment against those who had wronged them. In I En. 9.10 the souls of the dead called for judgment upon the wickedness of the earth:

> καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ βοῶσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν τετελευτηκότων καὶ ἐντυγχάνουσιν μέχρι τῶν πυλῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ στεναγμὸς αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γινομένων ἀνομημάτων.[324]

One particular moment of this motif was the complaint filed by the spirits of the slain against their murderers. In I En. 22.5-7 the spirits of the righteous slaim were represented by the spirit of Abel who called for judgment upon the seed of Cain (Gen. 4.10):

> καὶ<῞Αβελ> ἐντυγχάνει περὶ αὐτοῦ μέχρι τοῦ ἀπολέσθαι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθῇ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ.

Again according to I En. 22.12, a separate chamber in Sheol was set aside for the spirits of sinners who had been slain and who ἐμφανίζουσιν περὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας, ὅταν φονευθῶσιν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. Also in this context should be placed Rev. 6.10 where the souls of Christian martyrs from beneath the heavenly alter bore witness against and called for judgment upon those who were slaying the saints: ἕως πότε, ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός, οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;

---

[324] The Greek text of I Enoch cited here and elsewhere was from the edition of the fragments published by R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893).

In the *Visio sancti Pauli* (18) one of the witnesses against the defendant was another soul whom he had murdered. Upon seeing this soul, the defendant exclaimed: "Domine, nondum completum est annum ex quo hanc interfeci et sanguinem eius fudi in terra. . . ." In this case the witness was also a plaintiff, and the judgment was his requital. That the judgment in the *Visio* was understood as that demanded by the souls of the slain in I En. 22 and Rev. 6.10 was shown by the reference to the special place where, as in I En. 22.12, the souls of the slain were kept: "Knewest thou not that he that doth violence to another, if he that suffered violence die first, he is kept in this place until he that hurts him dieth, and then do both of them appear before the judge?" In other words, this statement by the judge in the *Visio* would appear to associate the judgment scene there with the judgment petitioned for by the slain in the Apocalyptic tradition. In this case the plaintiff-witness in the *Visio* would be the soul of the slain who bore witness and petitioned for judgment against its murderer in Jewish Apocalyptic.

In spite of the fact that the second witness in the judgment scene of the Apocalypse of Paul testified concerning murders committed by the defendant (21.2-9), the tradition was not that employed in the Visio. The difference lay in the person of the witnesses. If in the Visio the witnesses were the souls of the dead who had suffered injury at the hand of the accused, in the Apocalypse the witnesses were not other human souls at all but supernatural beings. For in each instance the testimony of the three witnesses was based on their having gone into the cosmos and to the defendant at different hours of the day (20.28-29; 21.4-6, 11-12). As such, they were celestial and spiritual beings. At the same time they were more than witnesses to the sins committed by the soul. For the third witness testified before the soul: "I gave darkness to you until you perfected your sins" (21.13-14). Whether the "darkness" be taken literally as referring to the darkness of night under whose cover sins were committed or as referring to spiritual blindness, the third witness claimed to have provided the soul with that darkness and thereby at the same time implicated himself as an accomplice in the sins committed by the soul. Moreover, since the complicity of the third witness in the sins of the soul was so clearly expressed, the activity of the other two witnesses should be interpreted similarly. Hence, the "desiring" (ἐπιθυμεῖν) of the soul by the second witness would be understood as related in some degree causally to the murders which the soul then committed (21.5-9). Finally, that which antagonized the soul until it was aroused to "anger, [wrath], and envy" would have been the activity of the first witness (20.28-21.2). It was with this understanding of the activity of the witnesses in mind that the speech of the first witness in lines 20.30-21.2 was restored to read: "[I did not cea]se to rise up against you until [I found you] in anger, [wrath], and envy."[325] In any event, the testimony of the third witness clearly implicated him in the sins committed by the soul, and this means that the third witness, and probably the other two as well, was not only a witness to the sin committed by the soul but the tempter who led the soul into sin.

The background for the idea of the tempter-witnesses of the Apocalypse of Paul was the demonology of Jewish Apocalyptic. According to the myth of the fall of the angels (Gen. 6.1-4) as elaborated in I En. 15, when the giants died who were born from the illicit union of the angels with the daughters of men, their spirits remained behind to become the πνεύματα πονηρά upon the earth.[326] Together with the fallen angels these evil spirits constituted the hosts of Satan, the "Prince of Darkness" concerning whom it was said in the Manual of Discipline (IQ S, iii.18-23f.): "All the spirits of his lot are for the tripping up [Hiph. of כשל] of the sons of light."[327] Recalling I En. 8.1-4 and 69.4-12, the tractate "On the Origin of the World" from Nag Hammadi codex II (CG II, 121.27-35; 123.2-24) reported the fall of the angels, their creation of the demon angels, and their subsequent leading astray of mankind.[328] Then in a variation of the myth, which was apparently taken from T. Reuben 5.6, the

---

[325] Translating the following text: [ⲘⲠⲒⲞⲨⲞ]Ⲩ ⲦⲰⲰⲚ Ⲉ[Ϩ]ⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰ //ϢⲀⲚ[ϯϬⲚⲦ]Ⲉ ϨⲚ ⲞⲨϬⲰⲚⲦ [ⲘⲚ] / ⲞⲨⲂ[ⲰⲖ]Ⲕ ⲘⲚ ⲞⲨⲔⲰ[Ϩ]. Instead of ⲘⲠⲒⲞⲨⲞⲨ in the first lacuna, Kasser, Muséon, LXXVIII, 1-2 (1965), 77, suggested ⲈⲢⲈⲠⲘⲞⲨ , but on p.78, n. 24 he wrote "ou quelque autre mot se terminant par Ⲩ ." With regard to the Achmimic ⲞⲨⲞⲨ for Sahidic ⲞⲨⲰ, see Böhlig on the "grosse Menge von Erscheinungen, die sonst auch dem Achmimischen oder Subachmimischen zugeordnet werden könnten . . ." in Codex V from Nag Hammadi in Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ., p. 12.

---

[326] On this and the myth as a whole, see I En. 6-16; 69. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* . . . , p. 232, n.3, explained the myth as it appeared in I Enoch as an expansion of "die orientalische Sage vom Engelfall . . . ," which lay behind Gen. 6.1-4 combined with Greek demonology. See further, H. D. Betz, "Zum Problem des religionsgeschichtliche Verständnisses der Apokalyptik," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 63 (1966), 391-409, esp. 401ff.

[327] Here and elsewhere the Eng. trans. of the Qumran scrolls was that of the present writer.

[328] A. Böhlig and Pahor Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

Apocryphon of John claimed: "And the angels changed their forms into the appearances of their husbands and they sowed with the spirit which tormented them in the darkness."[329] Having thus come to the daughters of men in the form of their husbands, the angels "took them and begot children out of the darkness through their Imitation Spirit."[330] This Imitation Spirit (ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα) was the antitype of the Holy Spirit which was created by the archons and thus sent into men, "and so the Imitation Spirit burdens their souls, draws it [the soul] to the works of wickedness, and brings it in this way to lack of perception."[331]

Having thus illustrated how much at home the myth of the fall of the angels was in that branch of Gnosticism represented by the Nag Hammadi find, the relationship between the three witnesses of the Apocalypse of Paul and the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic may now be shown. With the first witness of the Apocalypse (20.30) who "did not cease to rise up against [ⲦⲰⲞⲚ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰ =

---

[329] Ap. John BG, 74.11-15. Unless otherwise indicated, the Eng. trans. of Ap. John BG was that of W. W. Isenberg in Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), pp. 69-85. T. Reuben 5.6: μετεσχηματίζοντο γὰρ εις ἄνδρα καὶ ἐν τῇ συνουσίᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν συνεφαίνοντο αὐταῖς.

[330] Ap. John BG, 75.3-7.

[331] Ap. John BG, 69.1-5.

ἐξανιστάναι ἐπί_7 you . . . ," one should compare the spirits of Satan in I En. 15.12, who ἐξαναστήσονται . . . ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν. . . . With the third witness who gave darkness to the soul until it perfected its sins (21. 13-14), one should compare T. Gad 6.2 where the patriarch was led into darkness and sin by an evil spirit: τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ μίσους ἐσκότιζέ μου τὸν νοῦν, καὶ ἐτάρασσέ μου τὸν λογισμὸν πρὸς τὸ ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν. Then in the T. Judah 19.3-4 this darkness in which sin was committed was called ἀγνωσία and attributed to the Archon of Error: ἐτύφλωσε γάρ με ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης . . . . With regard to the second witness in the Apocalypse, the influence of the myth of the fallen angels was more directly evident. In I En. 6.2 the descent of the angels was described in terms of their being enamoured with the beauty of the daughters of men: καὶ ἐθεάσαντο αὐτὰς οἱ ἄγγελοι υἱοὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐπεθύμησαν αὐτάς . . . . When therefore, the coming of the second witness to tempt the soul was described in the Apocalypse (21.6-7) in terms of his "seeing" (N Y=θεᾶσθαι) and "desiring" (ἐπιθυμεῖν) the soul, one has an almost certain allusion to the seduction by the fallen angels.

That the motif of seduction by the fallen spirits was employed elsewhere in Gnosticism to explain the going astray of souls may be illustrated from logion 61 of the

Gospel of Philip (CG II, 65.1-66.2).[332] Here the going astray of male and female souls was attributed to their being seduced by female and male ἀκάθαρτα πνεύματα.

> Among the unclean spirits there are male and female. The male are they which unite (κοινωνεῖν) with the souls which inhabit (πολιτεύεσθαι) a female form; but the female are they which are mingled with those in a male form, through a disobedient (one). And none shall be able to escape them, since they detain him . . . .

Designating the unclean spirits as "ignorant men" and "ignorant women," the logion went on to describe their seduction of female and male souls.

> When the ignorant women see a male sitting alone, they leap down upon him and sport with him and defile him. So also the ignorant men, when they see a beautiful woman sitting alone they persuade her, they compel her, wishing to defile her.

It was just this seduction of the soul by the unclean spirits that was implied in the seeing and desiring of the soul by the second witness in the Apocalypse of Paul, and here as there those who seduced the souls were the fallen spirits of Jewish Apocalyptic who "descended to the earth . . . and seduced the children of men into committing sin"

---

[332] Here and elsewhere unless otherwise indicated the Eng. trans. of the Gospel of Philip was that of R. McL. Wilson The Gospel of Philip (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962).

(I En. 64.2).[333]

If the witnesses of the Apocalypse of Paul could thus be traced to the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic in their role as the tempters of the soul, there was no precedent in Jewish Apocalyptic for permitting the fallen angels to testify at the judgment against the souls whom they had led astray.[334] Indeed, the very fact that the spiritual beings who led the soul astray were allowed to appear at the judgment as witnesses against it signified that the judgment was now in the hands of the evil powers. Once again, therefore, the Apocalypse of Paul attested the

---

[333] In the light of the idea of the seduction of the soul by the witnesses, the body into which the first witness came (20.28-29) should probably be understood as the body of the soul which he occupied. On the cohabitation of demons with the souls in their bodies, see Hippol., *Elench*., VI.34.6 where the Valentinians were said to have taught that the heavenly *Logoi* dwell with the Gnostic souls ὅταν δαίμονες μὴ συνοικῶσι τῇ ψυχῇ. Cf. also *Mani*. *Ps*., p. 188.17 on "the thief that is in the house with me." For the antinomian libertine doctrine of the Cainites who employed this same idea to the opposite effect so that the angels who led the soul into sin were thereby saving him, see Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*., I. xxxi.2 (H. I, 242): "Et in unoquoque peccatorum et turpium operationum angelum assistere, et operantem audire audaciam et immunditiam inferre . . . ." On the same, see Epiphanius, *Panarion haer.*, 38.2: καὶ ὅταν ταῦτα πράττωσιν, οὕτως λέγουσιν "ὁ δεῖνα ἄγγελε, καταχρῶμαί σου τὸ ἔργον ἡ δεῖνα ἐξουσία, πράττω σου τὴν πρᾶξιν."

[334] Although unrelated to the judgment scene, the motif of Satan's witness against the saints (Job 1.6ff.; Rev. 12.10) was expanded to "the satans" at I En. 40.7, and at I En. 69.4 they were the tempters.

Gnostic reinterpretation of mythologumena of Jewish Apocalyptic.

The question remains, however, as to the background of the idea that the tempters of the soul were also the witnesses against it at the judgment. Although there was no mention of its testifying against the soul at the judgment, the evil spirit who came for the wicked soul and led it into punishment in the Γ. Asher 6.5 was identified as the very demon whom the soul in its lifetime ἐδούλευεν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἔργοις πονηροῖς . To this extent, therefore, the fallen spirits of Jewish Apocalyptic were already given a punishing role as well as a tempting role within Jewish Apocalyptic itself. In the case of the Apocalypse of Paul, however, the tempter-witnesses were said to have gone to the soul at specific hours of the day, the second, fifth, and twelfth hours. In Jewish Apocalyptic, the guardian angels were thought to descend and ascend at specific times of the day to pray and to bear witness with respect to the conduct of the souls under their charge.[335] Could, therefore, the tempter-witnesses of the Apocalypse represent a combination of the fallen angels and the guardian angels of Jewish Apocalyptic? Certainly from the Gnostic viewpoint the guardian angels who served the Hebrew God would be regarded as evil and, therefore, indistinguishable from the fallen angels. Thus combined with the fallen angels, the guardian angels could become the tempters who also testified against the soul at the judgment just as the guardian angel of the wicked soul in the *Visio* prosecuted the judgment against the soul to whom he had been appointed.[336]

---

[335] E.g., III (Gr.) Bar. 11-16.

Although the possibility existed of thus identifying the tempter-witnesses of the Apocalypse with the fallen-guardian angels of Jewish Apocalyptic as reinterpreted by Gnosticism, there was also evidence of a different influence. The tempters went to the soul at different times of the day, the second, fifth, and twelfth hours. That the calculation involved was the division of the hours into the twelve of day and the twelve of night was indicated by the equation of the twelfth hour of the day with the hour of sunset in the testimony of the third witness (21.11-13). The witnesses were, therefore, certain celestial beings whose influence upon man was regulated in some way according to the division of the hours into the twelve of day and the twelve of night. Although this particular division of the hours could reflect simply the Egyptian system and thus indicate the geographical origin of the Apocalypse, it could also reflect the δωδεκάωρος , the astrological system which divided the day into twice twelve hours and appointed stellar deities over each (double) hour.[337] In this case, the three witnesses of the Apocalypse would have been the stellar deities of the second, fifth and twelfth hours.[338] The appropriateness of thus casting the hour-gods in the role of witnesses at the judgment resided in the fact that the astrologers had already designated them the δικασταὶ τῶν ὅλων .[339] It was because of their role in the judgment of the world in astrology that the gods of the *dōdekaōros* appeared in the Pistis Sophia (chap. 126) as the archons who ruled the twelve chambers of judgment (κρίσις) and punishments (κολάσεις) in the dragon of outer darkness, the Gnostic hell.[340] In conclusion, the tempter-witnesses of the

---

[336] *Visio Sancti Pauli* 17.

---

[337] Boll-Bezold, pp. 57, 142, 147.

[338] How Kasser, p. 78, saw in the visit of the three witnesses to the soul at different times of the day a spiritualized paraphrase of the parable of the workers in the vineyard (Mt. 20.1-6) is beyond comprehension. Cf. the idea that Jupiter sent different constellations to earth to witness and record the deeds of men in the prologue to Plautus *Rudens* and the stars of the thirty-six decans, the βουλαίους θεούς , who took turns watching and reporting the deeds of men in Diodorus Siculus II.30f. To this see Nilsson, II, 186, 263f.

[339] Diodorus Siculus II.21.4. To this, see Boll, p. 36.

[340] So Gundel in Boll-Bezold, pp. 187-91. See also Boll, pp. 35-36, who saw behind the figure of the twenty-four elders of Rev. 4.4 the twenty-four hour-gods of the double *dōdekaōros*. For the use of the *dōdekaōros* by the

Apocalypse of Paul derived from the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic in their role as tempters and from the hour-gods of Hellenistic astrology with perhaps the added influence of the guardian angels of Jewish Apocalyptic in their role as witnesses against the soul at the judgment.

To summarize, it has been shown that the *telōnēs* derived from the planetary deities of Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology, the punishing-psychopomps from the Greek Erinyes and the demon psychopomps of the Iranian religion as possibly mediated through Jewish Apocalyptic, and the tempter-witnesses from the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic and either or both the guardian angels of Jewish Apocalyptic and the hour-gods of Hellenistic astrology. Although the demonology of the Apocalypse was thus highly syncretistic, combining elements from the Greek, Jewish Apocalyptic, Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology, and perhaps the Iranian tradition; the combination was executed by a single principle which may be called the Gnostic principle. In order to clarify this

---

[340] (Contd.) Peratae, see Hippol. *Elench*. v.13.6. See also the Greek fragment of the Apocalypse of Adam (to be distinguished from the Apocalypse of Adam from Nag Hammadi codex V), which contained the νυχθήμερον, or "Table of the Hours of the Day and Night," with Hebrew names for the hours and an indication of the worship of divine and demonic beings appropriate to the various hours, which was published by M.R. James together with parallels from other fragments in *Apocrypha Anecdota* ("Texts and Studies," II. 3; Cambridge: University Press, 1893), pp. 138-45.

principle, one may look first at the role of the demons in the context of death and judgment in other Gnostic texts and then at their role in the judgment scene of the Apocalypse of Paul.

Recalling that the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic occurred in logion 61 of the Gospel of Philip as the seducers of the soul, it should now be observed that, as in T. Asher 6.5, when the soul left the body at death, those same spirits "seize him and throttle [him]. And how will [this one] be able to escape . . . ."[341] Again, the ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα, who in the Apocryphon of John was associated with the fall of the angels and was the tempter of souls, came to the soul at death. "After the soul is unclothed, it [the Imitation Spirit] delivers it to the powers which are under the Archon. They [the souls] will once more be cast into fetters . . ..,"[342] i.e. the souls were subjected to reincarnation.[343] Finally, in the Pistis Sophia the ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα as well as the ἐριναῖοι λειτουργοί were the witnesses of the sins committed by the souls whom they also led to judgment, and here the purpose of their witness and the judgment of the souls was said to have been "damit (μήπως) sie ja nicht aus den Örtern (τόποι) des Chaos (χάοι) herauskommen . . . ."[344] It was in this tradition that the punishing-psychopomps and the tempter-witnesses of the Apocalypse of Paul must be understood. For as a result of their having tempted the soul to sin, their bringing it to judgment, and their testimony against it, "the soul was cast down, it went into a body which had been made ready for it" (21.19-20). In short, the punishing-psychopomps and the tempter-witnesses in association with the telōnēs-judge had been able to prevent the soul's escape to the light kingdom by subjecting it to reincarnation.

---

[341] CG II, 65.32-34.

[342] Ap. John BG, 69.5-10.

[343] Otherwise, Giversen, pp. 266-67, argues against reincarnation in this passage from Ap. John. Instead he wished to interpret so that the soul was joined with another soul yet in the body as a "co-spirit." This, it must be observed, would still be reincarnation! The sense must be that the soul would be rejoined with a (its?) spirit and placed in a "righteous body," i.e. one elected to righteousness, in which it would come to gnosis. Cf. Pistis Sophia 111 (Till, pp. 182.21-185.20) where the power (=pneuma) separated from the soul goes to the Light-Virgin while the soul was first purged and then went to the Light-Virgin. Then the soul was rejoined with a

Although the concept of metensōmatosis was probably borrowed from the Orphico-Pythagorean tradition, it was nevertheless the logically most appropriate form of punishment which the cosmic powers of Gnosticism could give the souls who fell under their judgment. Even where

---

[343](Contd.) power from the Light-Virgin and reincarnated together with its power.

[344]See above, pp. 80-81, and Pistis Sophia 113 (Till, pp. 189.5-191.33), 115 (Till, pp. 192.18-194.17, esp. p. 193.17-18).

there was no explicit judgment scene like that of the Apocalypse, the ascent itself was a contest in which only the initiated, i.e. the Gnostic, soul could be acquitted and gain release. "I see a great dread from the earth up to the skies; woe is me therefore: where can I escape unless thou ferry me across, my Lord?"[345] The punishment which the unsuccessful soul could expect was grounded ontologically in the opposition of light and darkness, of spirit and matter. Or better, it was grounded in the dependence of matter upon the spirit for its subsistence, the dependence castigated by the Gospel of Thomas (log. 112): "Woe to the flesh (σάρξ) which depends upon the soul (ψυχή)."[346] For the pneumatic soul was to the world of matter what it was to the human body, namely the animating force. The Gnostics, according to Epiphanius, βρῶμα δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν τὴν ψυχήν, ἄνευ δὲ αὐτῆς μὴ δῦνασθαι αὐτοὺς ζῆν, διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄνωθεν ἰκμάδος αὐτὴν εἶναι καὶ δύναμιν αὐτοῖς παρέχειν .[347] The same metaphor of the soul as the nourishment of the archons lay behind the statement regarding death and the ascent in the Gospel of Thomas (log. 60): "You yourselves, seek a place (τόπος) for yourselves in Repose (ἀνάπαυσις) lest you become a corpse (πτῶμα) and be eaten."[348]

---

[345] Mani. Ps., p. 61.30-31.

[346] CG II, 51.10-11; cf. log. 29, 87 (CG II, 38.31 ff., 48.4ff.

[347] _Panarion_ _haer_., 40.2.

Hence, from the ontological premise that matter was dependent upon the pneumatic soul, the logical and textually most frequent form of punishment inflicted upon the soul by the cosmic powers was reincarnation.[349] From the viewpoint of the cosmic powers, the soul must be kept in the world of matter and under their authority. All the activity of the world powers were but strategems to bring about this imprisonment of the soul. Hence, in the Apocalypse of Paul it was through the body, i.e. through the passions thereof, that the tempting spirits held sway over the soul, and when the soul would escape the body at death the psychopomps seized it and led it forth to a judgment which resulted in its being cast again into another body. Knowing this, it would appear somewhat facetious to laud the ethical character of the judgment in the Apocalypse. For the sole purpose of that judgment was to keep the soul under the authority of the cosmic powers. The only ethical teaching would be of negative character regarding how to avoid the judgment and escape this world. The judgment of the Apocalypse was that concerning which the Gnostic prayed in the hour of death in the Acts of Thomas:

---

[348] CG II, 43.20-23.

[349] E.g., Pistis Sophia 103 (Till, p. 170.16-21), 111 (Till. p. 185.13-20); Ap. John BG, 69.5ff. (see above, n. 343) for Mandeans, Ginza L., II.5 (L., p. 461.6-14); for Manicheans, Keph. 91, pp. 228-30; Simon Magus in Irenaeus, _adv_. _Haer_., I.23.2 (H. I, 192); Carpocrates in Irenaeus, _adv_. _Haer_., I.25.4 (H. I, 208ff.); and Valentinians of _Exc_. _ex_ _Theodoto_, 28.

> παράσχου οὖν μοι κύριε
> ἵνα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ παρέλθω . . .
> καὶ στῶ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ δικαστοῦ.[350]
> μὴ λαμβανέτω τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν μηδείς,
> ἣν παρέδωκά σοι.
> μὴ βλεπέτωσάν με οἱ τελῶναι,
> καὶ οἱ ἀπαιτηταὶ μὴ συκοφαντείτωσάν με.[351]

In conclusion, the history of religions investigation of the judgment and punishment of souls in the fourth and fifth heavens in the Apocalypse of Paul has disclosed: (1) that the judgment scene in the fourth heaven, both with regard to structure and the concepts of the book and witnesses, derived from Jewish Apocalyptic and (2) that the dramatis personae, the telōnēs-judge, the punishing-psychopomps, and the tempter-witnesses, represented a syncretistic demonology deriving in the main from the traditions of Jewish Apocalyptic, Greek religion, and Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology with the possibility that the concept of the demon psychopomps of the Iranian religion was mediated through Jewish Apocalyptic. What this means, in effect, is that the judgment of the dead from Jewish Apocalyptic has been severed from the authority of the supreme God and placed under the authority of the demonized cosmic powers. More accurately, the judgment of the dead remained under the authority of the Hebrew God, but that God was himself reduced to the stature of the evil Demiurge and Cosmocrator who ruled over the material cosmos from the seventh heaven while the highest and divine realm was located above him. This Gnostic demonizing of the cosmos was, therefore, the principle by which the disparate elements from different traditions were combined to form the syncretistic demonology of the Apocalypse. By combining, for instance, the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic with the stellar deities of the _dōdekaōros_ to form the tempter-witnesses, not only were the fallen angels thereby elevated to the stature of stellar deities but the hour-gods were reduced to the stature of evil demons. The cosmos was thereby demonized from the earth to the stars. The demonology of the Apocalypse does not represent, therefore, a further development of the cosmic dualism of Jewish Apocalyptic and Hellenistic astrology but the Gnostic solution of that dualism by collapsing it into a cosmic monism of evil.[352]

---

[350] Acts of Thomas 148 (L. B. II.2, p. 258.15-17).

[351] Acts of Thomas 167 (L. B. II.2, p. 281.9-11). For a similar Gnostic martyr prayer asking protection against judge and enemy after death, see II Apocalypse of James (62.16-63.29) in Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen* . . ., pp. 56-85. For the idea of the judgment of the dead in other Gnostic texts, see, for the Marcosians, Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*. I.13.6 (H. I, 123ff.); for the Mandeans, Ginza L., I.2 (L., p. 433.19f); cf. Ginza L., III.21 (L., p. 545.32f.) and Ginza L., I.4 (L., p. 445.8-12) where judgment and punishment was experienced in each of the heavens; for the Manicheans, *Mani*. *Ps*., pp. 22.11-19; 51.29; *Keph*., p. 235; for the Pistis Sophia 111 (Till, p. 185.5) and Till, index, s.v. "Lichtjungfrau (die 'Richterin')" where the judge was probably modeled after Dike in the Greek tradition.

---

[352] See the discussion of Gnostic dualism over against cosmic dualism by Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, I, 161ff.

CHAPTER IV

THE EPIPHANY

In terms of content, the Apocalypse of Paul was a narrative of the Apostle's ascension to the tenth heaven. Both in superscription and colophon, however, this narrative bore the title ⲦⲀⲠⲞⲔⲀⲖⲨⲮⲒⲤ ⲘⲠⲀⲨⲖⲞⲤ , "The Revelation of Paul." The question is, In what sense was the ascension understood to be the revelation of Paul? In short, how is the document which calls itself ἀποκάλυψις Παύλου to be interpreted? The hermeneutical key to the document as a whole was provided by two passages: (1) the epiphany scene and the ascent to the third heaven (17-19.25) and (2) the interrogation scene in the seventh heaven (22.23-24.1). These passages must now be subjected to a detailed interpretative analysis.

The epiphany scene may be outlined as follows: (1) the appearance of the little child (17-18.14), (2) the first revelation discourse (18.14-19.7), and (3) the second revelation discourse (19.8-20). The transition from 1 to 2 was provided by 18.10-14 and from 2 to 3 by 19.8-10. The Greek demonstrative adverb τότε marked the transition from the epiphany scene to the ascension (19.

20). In this chapter, each of the three parts of the epiphany scene will be treated in turn, and then the ascension to the third heaven will be examined.

The major problem confronting the criticism of the first part of the epiphany scene at 17-18.14 was the textual one. Apart from a few scattered characters, the first lines of the text were entirely missing (17-18.3), and the right half of the next seven lines was destroyed (18.4-10). Fortunately, however, two key lines (18.6-7) of the damaged text can be reconstructed with a fair degree of certainty. The fact that 18.7 began with the particle ⲚϬⲒ followed by the nominal subject ⲠⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ ϢⲎ[Ⲙ] ("the little chil[d]") indicated that the preceding word at the end of the lacuna in line 6 was a verb with a pronominal subject in the third masculine singular. What this particular verb was at the end of line 6 could be reasonably conjectured from what followed in lines 7 and 8. For since line 8 began with the conjunction ϪⲈ in *oratio recta*, one may assume: (1) that the lacuna in line 7 contained a verb of saying and (2) that the missing verb at the end of line 6 was a corresponding verb of saying or answering. In the light of the construction employed at 18.5 and 18.14-15, the most judicious reconstruction would be that of Kasser[353] for the final verb in line 6 and that of

---

[353] Kasser, p. 77.

Böhlig[354] for the lacuna in line 7. Thus reconstructed lines 6b-7 would read: [. . . ⲀϤⲞⲨⲰϢⲂ] / ⲚϬⲒ ⲠⲔⲞⲨⲈⲒ ϢⲎ[Ⲙ̄ ⲈϤϪⲰ ⲘⲘⲞⲤ]. "[. . .Then answered] / the little chil[d̄, saying]."

The restoration of line 6 was not yet complete, for there was space remaining in the lacuna for a word preceding the above restored ⲀϤⲞⲨⲰϢⲂ , "then answered." Again there was an indication of what the missing word was. For the extant part of line 6 mentioned the "road to . . ." some place. Hence, the other missing word was a place name. Since, moreover, the initial characters ⲐⲒ were extant before the lacuna, the missing place name was one which began with ϨⲒ-- (ⲐⲒ = definite article T combined with ϨⲒ), "J--." In terms of space, either Jerusalem or Jericho would fit the lacuna. On the basis of 19.12-13 where Paul was located on "the mountain of Jericho," one's first inclination would be to follow Böhlig in restoring the place name at 18.6 with the term "Jericho."[355] However, as it shall be demonstrated below,[356] the document had to do with the journey of Paul to Jerusalem in Gal. 2.1ff., and for this reason one should understand that Paul was at (the mountain of) Jericho (19.12-13) on the road to Jerusalem (18.6). Thus reconstructed 18.6 would read: ⲛϩⲓⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉ̅ⲑ̅ⲓ̅[ⲏ̅ⲙ̅· ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ], "road to J[erusalem. Then answered]."[357]

---

[354] Böhlig in Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ., p. 20. Followed by Kasser, p. 77.

[355] Against this reconstruction, the place name in the lacuna at 18.6 had the heavy supralinear stroke used to mark nomina sacra (Ⲑ̄Ⲓ̄) whereas the term "Jericho" was written at 19.13 without the stroke (ϨⲒⲈⲢⲒϪⲰ).

[356] See below, pp. 160ff.

Having now reconstructed lines 18.6-7, the analysis of the appearance scene may be undertaken by first giving a translation of 18.3-16.

3]in[
4 road. And [
5 saying: "[
6 road to J[erusalem?" Then answered]
7 the little chil[d, saying:]
8 "Say your name that [
9 you the road." [ ] was [
10 He knew Pa[ul
11 He wished to [speak to]gether with
12 him with his words i[n order that (ἵνα)]
13 he find an opportun[ity to] speak
14 with him. Then answered the little
15 child, saying: "I know
16 you, Paul, who you are. For

---

[357] ⲑ̅ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲙ̅ ="Jerusalem" contracted and written with the supralinear stroke as elsewhere in the same manuscript

The general setting provided by the above lines was clear. It had to do with an encounter between Paul (lines 10 and 16) and a little child (lines 7 and 14-15) as the request for the name at line 8 indicated. That the encounter took place on "the mountain of Jericho" was stated at 19.11-13. A conversation ensued between Paul and the little child with the former speaking in lines 5-6a and the latter in lines 8b-9a. Paul mentioned in some manner "the road to J[erusalem(?)], and the little child replied by asking Paul's name and referring back to the road mentioned by Paul. The most obvious conjecture would be that Paul had asked the little child to show or tell him the road to (Jerusalem?), to which request the little child responded by asking Paul's name and promising to tell him the road to (Jerusalem?).[358] In any event, Paul met a little child on "the mountain of Jericho" and mentioned to him "the road to J[erusalem(?)]." The little child responded by asking Paul's name. As the following state-

---

[357](Contd.) (CG V, 25.15; 44.14). At CG V, 36.19, Jerusalem was abbreviated ⲒⲖⲎⲘ, and at CG V, 37.12 it was spelled out.

[358] So also according to Kasser's reconstruction of lines 4-9 (pp. 77, 300): "...[ⲁ]ⲩⲱ [ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ] / [ⲉ]ϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ[ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ϩⲛⲁϣ] / ⲛϩⲓⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲑⲓ[ⲉⲣⲓⲭⲱ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ] / ⲛϭⲓ ⲡⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ϣⲏ[ⲙ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ] / ϫⲉ ⲁϫⲓ ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ ϫⲉⲛ[ⲧⲁⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲙ] / ⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ. "et [il repondit (?)], disant: '[par quel] chemin [irai je (?)] a Je[richo?' Il repondit], le petit, [disant]: 'dis ton nom, pour [que je] te [fasse sa]voir le chemin'."

ment indicated, however, the little child already knew Paul and had asked his name only in order to engage him in conversation (18.10-14). Already by this it was apparent that the encounter between Paul and the little child on "the mountain of Jericho" was an epiphany scene in which the little child appeared to Paul as one possessing superior knowledge.

With regard to the origin of the figure of the divine child in the history of religions, Böhlig pointed to "jüdische Esoterik" as the source and, following Quispel,[359] cited the appearance of Metatron in the form of a youth in III Enoch.[360] Although this was a significant parallel, it was not sufficient to establish that the little child of the Apocalypse derived from "jüdische Esoterik." On the other hand, Böhlig properly related the figure of the little child in the Apocalypse to the polymorphic Christ who appeared first as a child and then became an old man in the *Acta Ioannis* (chap. 88), the *Actus Vercellenses* (chap. 21), and the Apocryphon of John.[361] In the latter document, however, the deity appeared as a great light in which there stood forth a little child who then became an old man.[362] The unity which thus appeared in different forms to the apostle explained: "I am the father. I am the mother. I am the son."[363] The trinitarian godhead had appeared as the mother (the Holy Spirit who is light)[364] in the form of light, as the father in the form of an old man, and as the son in the form of a little child. Hence, the figures of the old man and the little child represented the one god as father and son, the older and the younger god as one and the same.

---

[359] G. Quispel, Review of *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* by W. Till, *Vigiliae Christianae*, X (1956), 51-52.

[360] Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen*. . . , p. 16.

[361] *Ibid*.

As possible alternatives for the origin of this concept, one might consider the mystery of the Kabiroi from Thebes and Samothrace in which the παῖς Πρατόλαυς figured as the younger Dionysus, son of Κάβιρος the older Dionysus.[365] Again from the sphere of Greek religion, one might consider the figure of the younger and older Eros.[366] More important for the concept of the trinitarian godhead, however, was the figure of Harpocrates as the son of Isis and Osiris in the Hellenized Egyptian religion.[367] Also of significance here was the fact that Harpocrates was "Horus the Child," the child form of the ancient sun god, Horus. In this case, therefore, one not only has an older and younger form of the same god but a god who was at the same time the son of a father and mother in a trinitarian godhead. While not attempting at this point to solve the origin of the concept of the little child in the Apocalypse of Paul, the alternatives cited above should suffice to cast doubt upon Böhlig's reference to "jüdische Esoterik" as the source.

---

[362] BG, 20.19-21; CG II, 1.30-2.9.

[363] BG, 21.19-21; CG II, 2.13-14; CG IV, 3.6-8. The translation was that of the present writer.

[364] BG, 23.14; CG II, 3.17f.

[365] See above, n. 168, and Nilsson, I, 670ff.; II. 95ff., 350; Guthrie, p. 123ff.

[366] See Harrison, pp. 630; 640-45, esp. 644.

The fact is that the figure of the little child occurred frequently in Gnostic literature where it represented Jesus or the Risen Christ. By way of questioning the identification of the little child of the Apocalypse with Jesus or the Risen Christ, Böhlig cited several of the Manichean psalms in which the concept of the child occurred without, according to him, reference to Jesus.[368] On the contrary, however, in each of the texts cited by Böhlig the "youth" represented precisely the Jesus

---

[367] See Bonnet, s.v. "Harpokrates," and Nilsson, II, 605 and Taf. 9.2.

[368] Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . . , p. 16, citing Mani. ps., pp. 155.25; 167.64; 210.5f.

patibilis of Manichean doctrine.[369] In addition, as Böhlig himself conceded, the figure of the child also appeared elsewhere in Manichean literature as an emanation of Jesus. However, that which was obviously more significant for the identification of the "little child" (ΚΟΥΕΙ ϢΗΜ = παιδίον, παῖς νήπιος) in the Apocalypse were the texts in which a little child appeared to someone in an appearance vision. In the opening vision of the Apocryphon of John cited above, the godhead appeared to John as Christ the son in the form of a little child.[370] The appearance took place on a mountain,[371] and John was given a revelation which he was to share with his fellow disciples.[372] It was no doubt also the Risen Christ as the Son of God whom Valentinus claimed appeared to him as a παῖς νήπιος ἀρτιγέννητος who identified himself as the Λόγος and revealed a τραγικὸς μῦθος from which the heresiarch composed his system.[373] In the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae* there also appeared to Andrew ὁ κύριος

---

[369] On the concept of the *Jesus Patibilis* as the fallen and suffering world-soul, see H-C. Puech, *Le Manichéisme* (Paris: Civilisations de Sud, 1949), pp. 82ff., and Geo Widengren, *Mani und der Manichäismus* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1961), p. 69.

[370] See above, pp. 130-31.

[371] BG, 20.5; CG II, 1.19.

[372] BG, 76.5-77.5; CG II, 31.28-32.5; CG III, 39.15-40.9.

[373] Hippol., *Elench*., VI.42.2 (W. p. 173.22-25).

Ἰησοῦς γενόμενος ὅμοιος μικρῷ παιδίῳ . . . ,[374] and in the *Acta Ioannis* the Christ appeared in the form of a παιδίον in the context of the call of James and John.[375] Against the background of these Gnostic epiphany scenes in which Christ appeared in the form of a little child, the little child who appeared to Paul on the mountain of Jericho in the Apocalypse of Paul should without further consideration be identified with the Risen Christ.

The appearance of the little child to Paul on the mountain of Jericho reflects the tradition according to which the Risen Christ appeared to the disciples on a mountain to give them his final teachings and to commission them to be his evangelists or apostles. The mountain as the place where epiphanies occurred was already an important motif in the epiphanies of the Risen Christ in the New Testament. At Matt. 28.16-20 Christ appeared to the disciples on a mountain in Galilee, and in Acts 1.12 this motif was still reflected in the reference to Mount Olivet. As Matt. 28.16-20 shows, this form of the appearance story had to do with the commissioning of the disciples as the evangelists and apostles of the

---

[374] Chap. 33 (L.B. II.1, 115.6f.).

[375] Chap. 88 (L.B. II.1, 194.11).

Risen Christ.[376] Still at John 20.19-23 this motif was preserved, and in John 21 it was preserved with regard specifically to the commissioning of Peter as the chief apostle. Already at Luke 24.44-49, however, in addition to the revelation of Christ in the sense that Christ himself was revealed there was introduced the motif of the revelation of Christ in the sense of that which Christ revealed. Specifically, the Risen Christ taught the disciples how the λόγοι of the earthly Jesus should be interpreted (24.44). Again in Acts 1.3-11 this new motif of the post-resurrection teaching was taken up by Luke, and in this case Jesus was said to have spent forty days teaching the disciples about the Kingdom of God. The result of this addition of the teaching motif to the appearance story was that in addition to being commissioned by the appearance the disciples were also now properly instructed for their task as evangelists.

Appearance stories, in which the Risen Christ revealed himself and his teaching to the apostles and thereby commissioned and instructed them for their apostleship, were especially popular among the Gnostics. That the appearance took place on a mountain was a motif which still occurred in the Apocryphon of John,[377] the I

---

[376] Bultmann, p. 288f.

[377] BG, 20.5; CG II, 1.19.

Apocalypse of James,[378] the Letter of Peter to Philip,[379] the Sophia of Jesus Christ,[380] and the Pistis Sophia.[381] In the Gnostic documents the revelation imparted by the Risen Christ was of primary interest. According to the Pistis Sophia, Jesus spent eleven years after the Resurrection teaching the disciples the higher wisdom.[382] In _Das erste Buch des Jeû_ this post-resurrection revelation was called the "Lehre, ausser der es keine andere giebt, die Jesus, der Lebendige [i.e. the Risen], seinen Aposteln (ἀπόστολοι) gelehrt hat, indem er sagte: 'Dies ist die Lehre, in der die gesamte Erkenntnis wohnt.'"[383] As in Luke 24.44, the new revelation could consist of an interpretation of the sayings of the earthly Jesus. This was the case in the Gospel of Thomas from Nag Hammadi[384] and the Pistis Sophia.[385] On the other hand, the teaching could take the form of new revelation discourses as in the Gospel of Philip or the elaboration of cosmogonic and anthropogonic myths as in the Sophia of Jesus Christ, the Apocryphon of John, and the Letter of Peter to Philip.

---

[378] CG V, 30.18; 31.2.

[379] For this and all references to the Letter of Peter to Philip from Nag Hammadi codex VIII, I am indebted to my teacher, Prof. James M. Robinson.

[380] BG, 77.15ff.

[381] Chap. 2 (Till, p. 3.8-9).

[382] Chap. 1 (Till, p. 1.2-4).

[383] _Das erste Buch des Jeu_, chap. 1 (Till, p. 257.14-16).

[384] The Gospel of Thomas described itself as the λόγοι spoken by the Living (i.e. Risen) Jesus and recorded by Thomas (CG II, 32.10), but it consisted in the main of a Gnostic redaction of the sayings from the tradition of Jesus.

Those to whom the Risen Christ appeared and imparted his revelation could be the disciples as a group as in the Pistis Sophia,[386] the Gospel of Mary,[387] the Sophia of Jesus Christ,[388] _Das erste Buch des Jeû_,[389] and the Letter of Peter to Philip or individual apostles as in the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Philip, the Apocryphon of John, and the I and II Apocalypse of James. Finally, the Gnostic appearance stories preserved the motif according to which the revelation of the Risen Christ was the basis and occasion for the call and appointment to apostleship. In the Gospel of Mary,[390] this motif was combined with the motif of instruction in the final words of the Risen

---

[385] E.g. chap. 83 (Till, p. 119.4ff), 90 (Till, p. 131.23ff.), 95 (Till, p. 140.19ff.), 96 (Till, p. 148.10 ff.), 97 (Till, p. 149.38ff.).

[386] Chap. 2 (Till, p. 3.8).

[387] BG, 8.12ff.

[388] To "his Twelve Disciples and seven women" according to BG, 77.9ff.

[389] _Das erste Buch des Jeû_, chap. 1 (Till, p.257.15).

[390] BG, 8.21-9.2.

Christ: "Geht also und predigt das Evangelium (εὐαγγέλιον) vom Reiche. Ich habe kein Gebot (ὅρος) erlassen ausser (παρά) dem, was ich euch festgesetzt habe." In the II Apocalypse of James, the Risen Christ appeared to James and revealed to him: "Du bist ein Erleuchter und Erlöser der Meinigen, jetzt aber (δέ) der Deinigen. Du sollst (ihnen) Offenbarung geben und sollst Gutes (ἀγαθόν) unter ihnen allen hervorbringen."[391] This then was for James his appearance vision of calling just as the revelation of the Risen Christ reported in Gal. 1.11ff. was Paul's appearance vision of calling.

As the evidence cited above indicated, the motif of the appearance vision of calling, in which the Risen Christ appeared on a mountain to reveal his teaching and commission his apostles, was very much alive in Gnostic circles. When, therefore, the Apocalypse of Paul reported an encounter on the mountain of Jericho between Paul and the Risen Christ in the form of a little child, one suspects that this too was an appearance vision in which Paul was given the revelation and commissioned an apostle. In this case, the appearance of Christ as the little child in the Apocalypse would be parallel to the appearance vision of calling reported by Paul in Gal. 1.11-17.

---

[391] CG V, 55.17-22. See CG V, 49.23-50.12 for the appearance of the Risen Christ to James.

With regard to the revelation imparted to Paul by Christ in the Apocalypse, one observes that in the transitional sentence at 18.11-14 it was said that the little child had asked Paul's name in order that he might share his words with Paul. By this the following two paragraphs were defined. They were ⲚⲈϤϢⲀϪⲈ, λόγοι αὐτοῦ , 'his words.' Again in the transitional sentence which fell between the two paragraphs at 19.8-9, the preceding material, i.e. the first paragraph, was called ⲠⲒϢⲀϪⲈ , οὗτος λόγος , 'this word.' Each of the two paragraphs was, therefore, a *logos* delivered by the Risen Christ, a revelation discourse. Christ had appeared to Paul on the mountain of Jericho in the form of a little child and revealed to him his *logoi*.[392] Each of these *logoi*, or revelation discourses, must now be examined.

In the first revelation discourse (18.14-19.7), the most serious problem was again the textual one. Fortunately, however, enough of the text was extant to enable one to determine the general content of the discourse. In the badly damaged text of 19.1-7, the subject matter was clearly both cosmological, having to do with the cosmic powers, the archons (ἄρχων), authorities (ἐξουσία), arch-angels (ἀρχάγγελος), powers, and demons (δαίμων); and anthropological, having to do with "a seed of soul (ψυχή)." These lines apparently contained the fragments of a Gnostic anthropogonic myth which dealt with the fall of the "soul-seed" into the cosmos and under the influence of the cosmic powers.[393] The first discourse was not entirely given over to the anthropogonic myth, however, for the latter was preceded by material which related directly to the Apostle Paul (18.14ff.).

---

[392] See James M. Robinson, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ . Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q," in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Erich Dinkler (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr /Paul Siebeck/ 1964), pp. 77-96.

Where the first part of the discourse dealing directly with the Apostle Paul and the second part dealing with the anthropogonic myth were divided may still be ascertained with a reasonable degree of certainty. At 18.23 the imperatival construction employing ⲘⲀ- with the Ⲧ-causative occurred, thus signifying that the Apostle was addressed with an imperative and thereby indicating a turn in the discourse: ⲘⲀⲦⲞϤ[. . .]. At 19.10-11 the second discourse was introduced by the same construction: ⲘⲀⲦⲞⲨⲚⲞⲤ ⲠⲈⲔⲚⲞⲨⲤ / ⲠⲀ[ⲨⲖ]ⲞⲤ, "Awaken your mind (νοῦς), Paul!" Since this same construction, if not the same clause,[394] was employed at 18.23b, it indicated a turn in the first discourse and probably signified the beginning of the anthropogonic myth. In this case, the first revelation discourse would be divided into: (1) the material dealing directly with the Apostle Paul (18.14-23a) and (2) the anthropogonic myth (18.23b-19.7).

---

[393] 19.6-7 could refer specifically to the cosmic powers who lead souls astray. See above, pp. 108-112.

[394] Kasser, p. 300, reconstructed 18.23b as parallel to 19.10 so as to produce: ⲘⲀⲦⲞϤ[ⲨⲚⲤ ⲠⲈⲔⲚⲞⲨⲤ], "Awaken your mind (νοῦς)," but the spelling of the verb with the extra "o" militates against this reconstruction.

Although one would like to know the exact content of the anthropogonic myth in the second part of the discourse, the first part dealing with the Apostle Paul was decisive for the interpretation of the Apocalypse. Here too, however, there were some lacunae in the text. Kasser's restoration of the lacuna at 18.20 with ⲀⲠⲞⲤⲦⲞⲖⲞⲤ on an analogy with 22.14 instead of the shorter ⲘⲠ̄ⲚⲀ of 24.8 was justified by the requirements of space.[395] As for the verb in the lacuna at 18.19, Böhlig's use of ⲂⲰⲔ 'to go,' was demanded by the sense of the sentence, especially in the light of the preposition ϢⲀ, 'to,' at the beginning of 18.20.[396] A preposition such as Böhlig's ⲈϨⲢⲀЇ (ⲈⲔⲚⲀ[ⲂⲰⲔ ⲈϨⲢⲀЇ] , "you go up") was required by the fact that the "fellow apostles" were located above in the heavens.[397] At 18.18 and 18.21 Böhlig filled the lacunae with the verb ⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ , 'to call.'[398] Although these readings would be especially useful for the present writer's thesis with regard to the nature and meaning of the Apocalypse, neither could be confirmed. At 18.18 the verb ⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ would make the line too long. Instead, therefore, the verb ⲈⲒ 'to come,' was employed: ⲁϊ⌊ⲈⲒ⌉, "I have ⌊come⌉." At 18.21 on the other hand, the verb ⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ plus the status pronominalis of the preposition Ⲉ would fit very well: ⲁ⌊ⲒⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ⌉ , "I have ⌊called you⌉."[399] However, since the verb ⲤⲘⲞⲨ plus ⲈⲢⲞⲔ occurred at 18.17, one could just as well employ the same construction in the lacuna at 18.21: ⲁ⌊ⲒⲤⲘⲞⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ⌉ , "I have ⌊blessed you⌉." In either case, however, the line would still not be of average length. Hence, in the light of what followed in 18.22, line 21 could have terminated with an expression like ⲈⲒⲤ , 'behold!' As for the lacuna in 18.22f., the following reconstruction was conjectured: ⲁⲚⲞⲔ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲈⲦ⌊ϭⲁⲗⲠ ⲦⲈϨⲒⲎ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ⌉ / ⌊Ⲛ⌉ⲁⲔ, "I am he who ⌊reveals the road⌉ / ⌊to⌉ you."

---

[395] Kasser, p. 77.

[396] Böhlig and Labib, Koptische-gnostische Apokalypsen . . . , p. 20.

[397] Ibid. For Kasser's (p. 300) further addition

With the above suggested reconstructions, the first

397(Contd.) of ⲈⲦⲠⲈ , it can only be said that this or a similar addition needed to be made to the preposition ⲈϨⲢⲁⲒ to indicate that the direction was definitely upward. On the location of the fellow apostles in the heavens, see below, p. 165.

[398] Böhlig and Labib, Koptische-gnostische Apokalypsen . . . , p. 20.

[399] Kasser, p. 77, followed Böhlig at this point.

part of the first revelation discourse (18.14-23) may be translated as follows:

14 . . . Then answered the little
15 child, saying: "I know
16 you, Paul, who you are. For
17 you are he who was blessed from
18 his mother's womb because (ἐπειδή) I have [come]
19 to you that you may [go up above]
20 to your fellow [apostles (ἀπόστολος).]
21 Therefore, [I have blessed you. Behold,]
22 I am he who [reveals the road]
23 [to] you. Let [

Fortunately, the key sentence in this passage did not lie in the damaged part of the text but in lines 15-18, specifically in the phrase "from his mother's womb" in lines 17-18. This phrase contained the formula ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός , "from the mother's womb," which had been associated with the prophetic calling since Jer. 1.5:

> Πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἐπίσταμαί σε
> καὶ πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ μήτρας ἡγίακά σε,
> προφήτην εις ἔθνη τέθεικά σε.

As the parallelismus membrorum signified, the terms ἐπίστασθαι (ידע) and ἁγιάζειν (קדש) were equivalent ways of saying "to appoint (τιθέναι, נתן) a prophet." In this text, God claimed to have predestined Jeremiah for the office of prophet, and the way this predestination was expressed was by the phrases ἐν κοιλίᾳ and ἐκ μήτρας further heightened by the preposition πρõ(בטרם). The basic formula, however, was ἐκ μήτρας or ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός which had been used as a formula of predestination in the ancient Near East since the Sumerian kings who used it to define their claim to the sacred kingship.[400] It was just this simple formula that was employed by Second Isaiah (Isa. 49.1) to articulate the calling of the Servant of the Lord: ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου ἐκάλεσεν το ὄνομά μου . . . .[401]

More important was the fact that Paul himself employed the predestination formula to define his own apostolic calling in Gal. 1.15ff. Against the charge that he was in some way a subordinate apostle, Paul defended his apostolicity by claiming that his call had come from God and not from man: οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκι και αἵματι . . . (Gal. 1.16).[402] His call had not come through a conference with "flesh and blood" but through a revelation from God (Gal. 1.15f.): ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί . . . . No doubt dependent upon Isa. 49.1 and Jer. 1.5,[403] Paul claimed that God was the one who had consecrated and called him to proclaim his Son among the Gentiles. According to Gal. 1.15ff., Paul's apostleship was grounded at three points: (1) predestination (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός), (2) calling (καλεῖν), and (3) revelation of the Son of God (ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸν υἱὸν ἐν ἐμοί). As it shall now be shown, the formula "from his mother's womb" in the Apocalypse of Paul was also related to the call of the Apostle.

---

[400] S. N. Kramer, "The Oldest Literary Catalogue," _Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research_, No. 88 (Dec., 1942), p. 14, cited by J. P. Hyatt, Introduction and Exegesis to The Book of Jeremiah, _The Interpreter's Bible_ (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), V, 800.

[401] Cf. IQ H ix, 29ff.

[402] H. Schlier, _Der Brief an die Galater_ (12th ed. rev.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 21-23, 53-58.

The predestination formula was employed to identify Paul not once but twice in the Apocalypse:

18.17-18 "who was blessed from his mother's womb."

23.2-4 "who is blessed and was separated from his mother's womb."

The second instance differed from the first by the addition of the verb "to separate." This addition was decisive for the identification of the tradition employed by the Apocalypse. For the verb translated "separated" (ⲤⲘⲞⲨ) was the exact translational equivalent of the Greek verb ἀφορίζειν , which occurred together with the predestination formula only at Gal. 1.15: ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου . . . . The question concerning why the verb "to separate" occurred at 23.2-4 and not at 18.17-18 may be put aside for the time being.[404] The important matter for the present discussion is that the verb did occur at 23.2-4. For its presence there demonstrates that the clauses employing the predestination formula both at 23.2-4 and 18.17-18 were composed with Gal. 1.15 in mind. On the basis of this allusion to Gal. 1.15, there can be no doubt that the author of the Apocalypse consciously related the epiphany of the little child to the appearance vision reported by Paul in Gal. 1.11-17. Further insight into how the two appearance visions were related may be gained by investigating the usage of the verb "to bless" at 18.17-18.

---

[403] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

At 18.17-18 Christ in the form of the little child identified Paul as "he who was blessed from his mother's womb." If the phrase "from his mother's womb" was an allusion to the predestination formula ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός of Gal. 1.15, the use of the verb "to bless" (CMOY* μακαρίζειν) with the predestination formula should be regarded as an interpretative addition. This usage of the verb "to bless" in the context of an allusion to the appearance vision of Gal. 1.11-17 points to the tradition in which being blessed was defined specifically as being blessed with a divine revelation. One finds this usage in the New Testament in the Matthean version of the confession at Caesarea Philippi. In response to Peter's confession that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the Living God, Jesus said: Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνά, ὅτι σάρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ'ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Matt. 16.17). Like Paul in Gal. 1.15ff., Peter had received his revelation not from "flesh and blood" but from God who revealed his Son to him. That is to say, it was God who had revealed to Peter that Jesus was the Christ. Hence, Peter was the recipient of divine revelation, and it was specifically "because" (ὅτι) he had received the revelation that he was "blessed" (μακάριος).

---

[404] See below, pp. 204-209.

Matthew 16.17 was part of the tradition of the Palestinian church which sought to establish the apostolic authority of Peter.[405] Irenaeus correctly interpreted it as an epiphany scene to which he could appeal in arguing for Peter's apostolicity against those who claimed that Paul alone had received the revelation of the Christ.[406] Then in the Kerygmata Petrou, Matt. 16.17 was employed to establish the validity of Peter's revelation as an historical one over against the visionary and, therefore, invalid revelation claimed by Paul.[407] In this case, however, one has evidence that at the beginning of the third century the idea of being blessed was still understood as being blessed specifically with a divine revelation.[408] For here it was maintained that Christ had called Peter blessed ἐπὶ ἀποκαλύψει, "by virtue (or on the basis) of the revelation."[409] Finally, this usage of the idea of blessedness may be demonstrated in the very same manuscript in which the Apocalypse of Paul occurred, *viz*. in the II Apocalypse of James (CG V, 55.17-25). Here James was said to be a possessor of revelation which he must share with others, and for this reason it was claimed: "You are he whom the heavens call blessed (μακαρίζειν)."

---

[405] R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 138-40, 258, 259, considered the Matthean material to have derived from the Palestinian church in support of the authority of Peter.

[406] Irenaeus, adv. Haer., III.13.2 (H.II, 73).

In the instances cited above, being blessed was grounded in the reception of divine revelation, specifically in the revelation of Christ to an apostle, which revelation established his apostleship. That Paul's blessedness was similarly grounded in the Apocalypse was indicated by the causal clause which followed the pronouncement of his blessedness. There was in fact a formal similarity between the statement in the Apocalypse and that of Matt. 16.17.

---

[407] *Clem*. *hom*., XVII.18-19 (Rehm, pp. 239.8-240.22).

[408] Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958), p. 219, following von Harnack, dated the *Kerygmata Petrou* *ca*. A.D. 200.

[409] *Clem*. *hom*., XVII.19.2 (Rehm, p. 240.11). On this usage of ἐπί, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. by Robert W. Funk (from the 9-10th Ger. ed.; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), sec. 235.2, p. 123.

> Matt. 16.17: Μακάριος εἶ . . . ὅτι . . . .
>
> Ap. Paul 18.17-18: "You are he who was blessed . . . ἐπειδή . . . .

Peter was blessed because (ὅτι) God had revealed to him the Christ, i.e. that Jesus was the Christ. The Risen Christ himself in the form of a little child appeared to Paul and said to him: "You are he who was blessed from his mother's womb because (ἐπειδή) I have [. . .] you in order that you may [. . .] to your fellow [. . .]" (18.17-20). Despite the lacunae, it was clear that Paul's blessedness was grounded and that it was grounded specifically in the activity of the Risen Christ who appeared to him in the form of a little child, disclosed his logoi to him, and took him up into the heavens (19.20-24) where he met his fellow apostles (22.14; 24.2,8). In the light of the parallels in which an apostle's blessedness and apostleship were based on his reception of a divine revelation, one must conclude that it was the appearance, the revelation, of the Risen Christ to Paul in the form of the little child that made him blessed and grounded his apostleship. Once again, therefore, the appearance of Christ as the little child in the Apocalypse was entirely parallel to the appearance vision of calling reported by Paul in Gal. 1.11-17. For in both cases the revelation involved was that of the Risen Christ which made Paul an apostle.

To summarize, Christ appeared in the form of a little child to Paul on the mountain of Jericho and disclosed to him his logoi. The first revelation discourse began with Christ calling Paul by name and claiming to know him. Then he pronounced Paul blessed and appealed to his own activity as the basis for Paul's blessedness. What one has, in short, is an epiphany scene in which the Risen Christ appears to Paul, imparts to him the revelation, and thereby makes him an apostle. Hence, the revelation of the Apocalypse was Paul's appearance vision of calling in which he experienced the revelation of the Risen Christ. As such, the appearance vision of the Apocalypse was parallel to the so-called conversion of Paul in Acts 9.1-9 and the appearance vision appealed to by Paul himself in I Cor. 15.8 and Gal. 1.11-17. Whereas there was no indication that the author knew the appearance story of Acts 9,[410] he consciously related the epiphany of the Apocalypse to the appearance vision of Gal. 1.11-17 by having the little child quote the phrase "from his mother's womb" from Gal. 1.15. The situation was thus created in which the Risen Christ appeared as a little child to Paul in an appearance vision of calling and quoted from Paul's own account of his appearance vision of calling. What this must indicate is that the appearance vision in the Apocalypse was intended to be an interpretation of the vision of calling reported by Paul in Gal. 1.11-17. In this case, Christ as the little child was not quoting Paul from Gal. 1.15 but was revealing to Paul what the Apostle had subsequently reported in Gal. 1.15.

---

[410] Does this suggest that The Acts of the Apostles was not included in the canon of the Gnostic author?

It will be recalled from above[411] that in Gal. 1.15f. Paul grounded his apostleship on three factors: (1) predestination (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός), (2) calling (καλεῖν), and (3) revelation of the Son of God (ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸν υἱὸν ἐν ἐμοί). With regard to the first factor, the Risen Christ in the Apocalypse of Paul actually quoted the predestination formula from Gal. 1.15. With regard to the concept of calling, the appearance of Christ as the little child to Paul actually constituted a vision of calling. Moreover, in spite of the fact that the verb "to call" did not occur in the extant text of the Apocalypse, the act of calling did in fact occur, namely in the opening words of the first revelation discourse at 18.15-16: "I know you, Paul . . . ." Already in the Old Testament the concept of calling could be expressed in terms of the calling of one's name. Hence at Isa. 49.1 the call of the Servant was expressed in terms of Yahweh's having called his name: "The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name." In the LXX the same verse ran: Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομά μου . . . . At Isa. 43.1 the idea of calling by name was explicitly stated in the Hebrew text: קָרָאתִי בְשִׁמְךָ. Similarly, in the Damascus Covenant the elect of God were described as "men called by name" (קְרִיאֵי שֵׁם).[412] Against this background, the so-called conversion of Paul in Acts 9 could be designated Paul's calling. For the Risen Christ called him by calling his name: Σαοὺλ Σαούλ . . . (Acts 9.4).[413] That the words "I know you, Paul, who you are" also constituted Paul's calling in the Apocalypse may be shown from the Gnostic concept of the call in the Gospel of truth (21.25-22.9). Here the Gnostic was described as a being from heaven who, "if he is called, he hears, replies, and turns towards Him who calls him, in order to reascend to Him. And he knows what he is called" (22.3-9). What he was called was his name. Hence, the coming of the call could be described as "one's name comes to him" (22.12f.), and the Gnostic could be defined as "he whose name has been spoken by the Father" (21.28-30). The names of the Gnostics had been registered beforehand in the Book of the Living (21.3-5, 23), and "those whose names He knew in advance, were called at the end . . . " (21.25-27). The call was thus the calling of one's name, and those who were called were known in advance. Here one has the conceptual background for understanding the words of Christ to Paul in the Apocalypse: "I know you, Paul, who you are." As in the description of the Gnostic call in the Gospel of Truth, the Risen Christ knew Paul and called him by his name.[414] As in Gal. 1.15 so also in the Apocalypse, Paul was a called apostle.

---

[411] See above, p. 145.

---

[412] CD ii, 11; cf. iv, 3f.

[413] So also E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (12th ed. rev.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 270. The view maintained by H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr /Paul Siebeck/ 1963), p. 59, that Luke distinguished between Paul's Easter vision and the vision on the road to Damascus and that Paul was not made an Apostle by the latter cannot be substantiated from the text. On the contrary, at 9.27 and 22.14-15 the appearance vision on the way to Damascus was interpreted by Luke as that which made Paul an apostle.

With regard to the third factor upon which Paul grounded his apostleship in Gal. 1.15f., i.e. the revelation of the Son of God to him, the very one who called Paul's name and quoted the predestination formula from Gal. 1.15 was the Risen Christ. That he appeared to Paul in the form of a little child must correspond to the claim in Gal. 1.16 that God ἀποκαλύφαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί . . . To sum up, the Apocalypse reported Christ's appearance in the form of a little child, his calling of Paul, and his use of the predestination formula of Gal. 1.15. There was, therefore, a basic agreement between what the Apocalypse reported and what Paul claimed in Gal. 1.15f. as the grounds of his apostleship. In view of this agreement and in light of the citation of Gal. 1.15, one may conclude that in all probability the appearance of Christ to Paul in the Apocalypse was an interpretation of the appearance vision of calling in Gal. 1.11-17. In this case, Gal. 1.11-17 and not II Cor. 12.2-4 was the textual point of departure for the Apocalypse.[415]

---

[414] For further evidence of the Gnostic call in the logoi of the little child, see below, pp. 162-64.

The above interpretation of the first part of the first revelation discourse was based entirely upon that part of the text which was fully preserved (18.14-18a). That is to say, the interpretation was achieved without benefit of the restored text of 18b-23a. Without in any way resting the interpretation upon those restorations, the interpretation may now be re-examined in the light of the entire passage including the restorations. By arranging the Coptic text of 18.16b-23a into four clauses a definite parallel construction was visible.

---

[415] Against Böhlig in Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen* . . . , p. 16, and apparently also H-C. Puech, *Coptic Studies* . . . , p. 135.

1 ϪⲈ ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲠⲈ ⲚⲦⲀⲨⲤⲘⲞⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ ϪⲒⲚϨⲚ ⲐⲎ ⲚⲦⲈϤⲘⲀⲀⲨ
2 ⲈⲠⲒⲆⲎ ⲀⲒ̈/ⲈⲒ̈7 ⲈⲢⲞⲔ ϪⲈ ⲈⲔⲚⲀ/ⲂⲰⲔ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ̈ ⲈⲦⲠⲈ.7
ϢⲀ ⲚⲈⲔϢⲂⲎ/Ⲣ ⲀⲠⲞⲤⲦⲞⲖⲞⲤ.7
3 ⲈⲦ/ⲂⲈ7ⲠⲀⲒ̈ Ⲁ/ⲒⲤⲘⲞⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲔ.7
4 /ⲈⲒⲤ7 ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲈⲦ/ϬⲀⲖⲠ ⲦⲈϨⲒⲎ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ Ⲛ7ⲀⲔ

Lines 1 and 4 were parallel constructions employing the nominal clauses ⲚⲦⲞⲔ ⲠⲈ ⲚⲦ-, "you are he who," and ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲈⲦ-, "I am he who." Lines 2 and 3 were also parallel causal clauses as apparent in the beginning conjunctions ἐπειδή, 'because,' and ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲠⲀⲒ (= διά, or δια τοῦτο), 'therefore', 'for this reason.' These four sentences thus constituted a chiasmic structure with a parallelism in the ab/ba pattern.

The parallelism involved was still preserved in the English translation:

a For you are he who was blessed from his mother's womb
b because (ἐπειδή) I have /come7 to you that you may /go up above7 to your fellow /apostles (ἀπόστολος).7

b Therefore, /I have blessed you.7
a /Behold,7 I am he who /reveals the road to7 you.

Lines 1 and 4 were disclosures of the identity of Paul and the little child respectively. Hence, in line 1 the little child disclosed to Paul that he (Paul) was blessed from his mother's womb. Line 4 was equivalent to the Greek ἐγώ εἰμι. . . and functioned as the divine self-predication in which the little child revealed himself to Paul, namely as the revealer.[416] Line 2, introduced by the causal conjunction ἐπειδή, stated the cause or ground for Paul's being called blessed in line 1. He was blessed *because* (ἐπειδή) the little child had come to him in order to take him to heaven to see his fellow apostles. Introduced by the conjunction ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲠⲀЇ, which summed up the preceding statement in lines 1 and 2, line 3 again affirmed that it was because the little child had come to Paul to take him to the apostles that Paul was blessed. In addition, however, line 3 clarified who it was that had blessed Paul with a divine revelation, *viz*. the little child who was then identified in line 4 as the revealer of the road.

As best as it can be determined from the fragmentary state of the text, the framework, or setting, of the Apocalypse was provided by an encounter between Paul and a little child in which a conversation took place concerning the road to somewhere. In fact, the second extant word of the text was the term "road" (18.4), and three times in the fragmentary lines of the preliminary conversation the word "road" occurred (18.4,6,9). Apparently, Paul asked the little child about the road to some place (18.6), and the little child responded by asking Paul's name and promising to show him the road (18.8-9). When next in the first revelation discourse the little child told him that he (Paul) would go up to his fellow apostles (18.19-20), one would assume that there was some relationship intended between the road mentioned in the preliminary conversation and Paul's going up to his fellow apostles. That is to say, one would assume that the motif of the road from the frame scene was not simply dropped but was carried over into the first revelation discourse where it was maintained in the concept of Paul's going up to his fellow apostles. In this case, the road discussed in the frame scene would be the road to the fellow apostles and the road traveled by Paul on his ascension into the heavens. It was on the assumption that the motif of the road was maintained in the concept of Paul's going up to the apostles that the lacuna in 18.22-23 was restored to read: "I am he who [reveals the road to] you." With this restoration, the little child, who at 18.22 had promised to show Paul the road, would now be informing him that he (Paul) was to go up to his fellow apostles (18.19-20) and that he (the little child) was the one who would reveal to him the road to those apostles (18.22). In any event, the narrative moved from a discussion of the road in the frame scene to a discussion of Paul's impending journey in the first revelation discourse, and to the extent that a road implies a journey and a journey implies a road, there was continuity of subject matter between the road of the frame scene and the journey to the apostles in the revelation discourse.

---

[416] E. Schweizer, *EGO EIMI . . .* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), pp. 30-32; 42-44.

Of more importance is the question regarding how the motif of the road and the journey to the apostles is to be understood if, as it has been maintained above, the epiphany scene was an interpretation of Gal. 1.11-17. For there was nothing regarding a road or a journey in the Galatians text. By examining now the second revelation discourse, it will become clear both how the road and journey motifs were related and how the motif of the journey to the apostles was brought into the interpretation of Gal. 1.11-17.

After the transitional sentence at 19.8-10a, the second revelation discourse began (19.10b-18a):

> Awaken your mind (νοῦς), Paul, and see that the mountain upon which you tread is the mountain of Jericho, in order that you may know the hidden things in the things which are revealed. Now (δέ) the Twelve Apostles (ἀπόστολος) are those to whom you shall go. For (γάρ) they are elect spirits (πνεῦμα). And they will greet(ἀσπάζεσθαι)you.

In the first revelation discourse Paul had been informed that he was to go up to his fellow apostles (18.19-20). Now in the second revelation discourse those fellow apostles were specifically identified as the Twelve Apostles. At the same time that the fellow apostles were specified as the Twelve, it was also disclosed that Paul was located on the mountain of Jericho. These two factors, Paul's present location on the mountain of Jericho and his impending journey to the Twelve Apostles, were disclosed together and must be interpreted together.

That an appearance vision of calling should take place on a mountain was perfectly understandable because mountains were appropriate sites for epiphanies. That the epiphany reported by the Apocalypse should take place on the mountain of Jericho was not at all apparent, however. For there was no tradition in which the Risen Christ appeared on the mountain of Jericho. One should not look for a geographical site corresponding to the mountain of Jericho. For the name Jericho was attached to the mountain of the epiphany by the author of the Apocalypse as a means of bringing together the appearance vision and the journey to the Twelve Apostles. It may be said that while the concept of the mountain belonged to the epiphany scene, the name Jericho belonged to the journey to the Twelve. These two motifs, the epiphany and the journey, were united by the combination "mountain of Jericho." The place name Jericho belonged to the journey motif not only textually, in the sense that the reference to Jericho and the Twelve occurred together in the text, but also functionally. For the place name Jericho defined the spatial separation between Paul and the Twelve which was to be overcome by the journey. That is to say, it defined the journey as a journey from Jericho to the Twelve Apostles. Paul was to go up from Jericho to the Twelve.

If the combination "mountain of Jericho" thus represented the bringing together of the motifs of the appearance vision and the journey, the union of these two motifs was not yet understandable. For if the appearance vision was an interpretation of Gal. 1.11-17, from whence was the idea of a journey to the Twelve derived, and by what rationale could such a journey be combined with the appearance vision of Gal. 1.11ff.? The answer to the latter lies in the fact that the journey as well as the vision was conceived as a revelation. With this, however, the answer to the first question was given. For the idea of a revelation which consisted in a going up to the apostles could have derived only from the ascension by revelation which Paul reported in Gal. 2.1f: ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . . ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.

Paul's going up to the apostles was the ascension to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles which he reported in Gal. 2.1ff. This immediately explains the use of the place name Jericho for the site of the epiphany scene. For by locating the epiphany scene at Jericho, Paul's journey was an ascension from Jericho to the apostles. As it could be ascertained from the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10.30-36) alone, Jericho lay below and on the road to Jerusalem, and the location of Paul at Jericho about to go up to the apostles would make perfect sense if the latter were located in Jerusalem as they were in Gal. 2.1ff. At the same time, this location of Paul at Jericho about to ascend to Jerusalem helps to clarify the connection between the motif of the road in the frame scene and the journey motif in the revelation discourses. For since Paul was already at Jericho but was on his way, so to speak, to Jerusalem, it would appear most likely that the road being discussed in the frame scene was the road to Jerusalem. Hence, the place name at 18.6 should be restored to read Jerusalem rather than Jericho: "road to J[erusalem? . . .]."[417] Paul encountered the Risen Christ in the form of a little child on the mountain of Jericho and asked him about the road to Jerusalem. The motif of the road was then continued in the revelation discourses in which Christ revealed to Paul his impending journey to the apostles in Jerusalem, the ascent by revelation of Gal. 2.1ff. Furthermore, it can now be said that the road and journey motifs were brought into the interpretation of the appearance vision of Gal. 1.11-17 by bringing together two successive texts which had to do with the revelation received by Paul, viz. Gal. 1.15f. and Gal. 2.1f. By thus bringing together Gal. 1.11-17 and Gal. 2.1ff., the author produced an appearance vision, i.e. an epiphany of the Risen Christ, which issued in an ascension to the apostles.

---

[417] See above, 127f.

Having thus discovered that the going up to the Twelve was based on the ascent to Jerusalem by revelation in Gal. 2.1ff., the particular manner in which that ascension was interpreted in the Apocalypse may now be examined. The second revelation discourse consisted of two parts, which may be designated the imperative (19.10-14) and the indicative (19.15-18) sections. The first section consisted primarily of two imperatives: "Awaken your mind (νοῦς)!" and "See!" In these two imperatives, one encounters again the motif of the Gnostic call.[418] With regard to the first imperative, the Coptic term translated "awaken" (ⲦⲞⲨⲚⲞⲤ) reflects the Gnostic view that man prior to gnosis was asleep, prostrate, or even dead. Hence, in the Apocryphon of John the call of the Gnostic Redeemer was: "He who hears, let him rise up from his heavy sleep."[419] Then in the tractate On the Origin of the World from Nag Hammadi Codex II, the archetype of the Gnostic call given by Eve, the daughter of Sophia, to Adam, who was prostrate because he had no soul (ψυχή), was said to have been in order "to awaken" (TOYNOC) him.[420] Then she called to him: "Adam! Live! Arise from the earth!"[421] Similarly, in the Apocalypse of Adam from Nag Hammadi the call to Adam, who had lost his original gnosis, was in terms of arising from death: "A[ri]se, Adam, from the [sl]eep of death!"[422] That the call in the Apocalypse of Paul was a call to gnosis was made clear by making the nous the object of the awakening: "Awaken your mind (νοῦς), Paul!" In addition, however, one should also see in this reference to the nous, which was to be awakened, the idea of the nous as the vehicle of revelation visions in the Gospel of

---

[418] See above, pp. 151ff.

---

[419] CG II, 31.5f. (Giversen, 79.5, p. 107).

[420] CG II, 115.30-34 (Böhlig and Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel . . .* , 163.30-34, pp. 78-81).

[421] *Ibid.*, CG II, 116.2-3 (164.2-3, p. 80).

[422] CG V, 66.1-3. Cf. Eph. 5.14.

Mary[423] as well as the idea of the ascension of the mind (διάνοια) in the achievement of gnosis in Poimandres[424] and the Gospel of Truth.[425]

In the Apocalypse the specific content of the call to gnosis was expressed by the second imperative: "See that the mountain upon which you tread is the mountain of Jericho." The gnosis to which Paul was called was further clarified by stating that Paul should awaken his nous and see "in order that you may know the hidden things in the things which are revealed." Paul was thus called to a gnosis of the invisible, heavenly realities which lie hidden, as it were, in their perceptible, earthly counterparts like the truth behind the symbol or the spirit behind the letter.[426] Since it preceded the disclosure that Paul was going up to the Twelve, this call to gnosis must be regarded as providing the hermeneutical principle by which the disclosure was to be interpreted. Put another way, the call to a gnosis of the "hidden in the revealed" provided the hermeneutical principle by which Gal. 2.1f. was interpreted in the Apocalypse. For it informed the reader that the going up from Jericho to Jerusalem to visit the apostles in Gal. 2.1ff. was to be interpreted allegorically. Hence, the Twelve Apostles to whom Paul was going were not the earthly apostles but "elect spirits (πνεῦμα)," and the Jerusalem in which they dwelled and to which Paul was going was not the earthly but the heavenly Jerusalem. The little child had promised that the Twelve would greet Paul and they did on two occasions: immediately when he looked up (19.18b-20), and again in the eighth heaven, the Ogdoad (24.1-3). The Twelve Apostles to whom Paul was going were located in the Ogdoad, and this means that the Jerusalem of Gal. 2.1f. has been interpreted as the heavenly Jerusalem of Jewish Apocalyptic[427] and the New Testament,[428] or more accurately as the Ogdoad of the Naassene[429] and Valentinian[430] equation Ogdoad=Jerusalem. In sum, the author of the Apocalypse interpreted the ascension to

---

[423] BG, 10.16-23.

[424] Poimandres, 1 (N.F., I, 7.2).

[425] CG I, 41.24ff. See also the Paraphrase of Shem, Doresse, p. 147.

[426] The distinction between the hidden and the revealed was not, therefore, that between the Twelve Apostles and the mountain of Jericho as maintained by Böhlig in Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ., p. 15. Cf. the discussion regarding the hidden in the revealed with regard to the sacraments in the Gospel of Philip (CG II, 57.24-26; 84.20-133.20; 86.11-13).

---

[427] IV Ezr. 8.52-54; II Bar. 4.2-7; II En. 55.2. See already the concept of the heavenly temple in Exo. 25.40; as the "pattern of Zion" in II Bar. 59.4; IV Ezr. 7.26; 10.25f.; "New Jerusalem" in I En. 90.28-29; T. Dan. 5.12.

[428] Gal. 4.26; Rev. 3.12; 21.2, 10.

[429] Hippol., Elench., V. 7.39 (W., p. 88.19f.).

[430] Irenaeus, adv. Haer., I.5.3 (H., I.45f.).

Jerusalem of Gal. 2.1f. just as Heracleon interpreted Jesus' ascension to Jerusalem in John 2.13-15: τὴν ⟨εἰς⟩ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἄνοδον σημαίνειν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑλικῶν εἰς τὸν ψυχικὸν τόπον, τυγχάνοντα εἰκόνα τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἀνάβασιν τοῦ κυρίου.[431]

Thus far it has been seen that the Apocalypse of Paul was an interpretation of Gal. 1.11-17 combined with Gal. 2.1f. By combining these two texts an appearance vision was produced which was at the same time an ascension to the Twelve Apostles in Jerusalem. By interpreting Gal. 2.1f. allegorically, the appearance vision was further transformed into an ascension to the heavenly Jerusalem to the twelve spiritual apostles. It may now be shown that this transformation of the ascent to Jerusalem into an ascension into the heavens was also textually grounded in the Pauline tradition. For when the little child caught Paul up into the heavens at the conclusion of the second revelation discourse, he took him directly "to the third heaven. And he pass[ed] beyond to the fourth [heaven]" (19.23-25). This "being snatched up" (ⲦⲰⲢⲠ = ἁρπάζειν) directly to the third heaven without so much as mentioning the first two and the immediate passing on to the fourth heaven without pausing to report what was seen and heard in the third no doubt reflects II Cor. 12.2-4. For there the Apostle Paul reported an ecstatic ascension in which he ἁρπαγενεις . . . ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ . . . . καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. By this it is clear that the transformation of the ascent to the apostles in Jerusalem into an ascension into the heavens was accomplished by combining Gal. 2.1f. with II Cor. 12.2-4.

---

[431] In Origen, *Joh. Com.*, X.33 (P., p. 206.25ff.).

It may now be said that the Apocalypse was based not on one but on three Pauline texts. What this means is that the author of the Apocalypse simply combined all three of the Pauline texts which had to do with the Apostle's revelation experiences (Gal. 1.11-17; 2.1f; II Cor. 12.2-4). The most difficult aspect of this combination was the identification of Gal. 2.1f and II Cor. 12.2-4. Although this identification may have been assisted by the fact that both experiences were dated by Paul with reference to "fourteen years" (Gal. 2.1; II Cor. 12.2), it was ultimately achieved only by interpreting Gal. 2.1f. allegorically. In any event, the author did identify the ascension of Gal. 2.1f. with that of II Cor. 12.2-4, and by combining this composite ascension with the vision of calling from Gal. 1.11-17, he produced a single unified revelation experience. The Apocalypse of Paul was an interpretation of that revelation so constructed from Gal. 1.11-17, Gal. 2.1f., and II Cor. 12.2-4.

CHAPTER V

THE INTERROGATION SCENE AND THE PURPOSE OF THE ASCENSION

In his monograph, The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book, Geo Widengren investigated the concept of the ascension of the prophet and apostle in the Old Testament, Jewish Apocalyptic, Samaritan, Mandean, and Hermetic literature.[432] Although his thesis regarding the Mesopotamian origin of the concept appears doubtful, especially with respect to the Jewish Apocalyptic and Mandean texts, he has nevertheless succeeded in demonstrating and explaining the concept.[433] The basic idea was that the prophet or apostle ascended to the highest heaven where he received divine revelation, was commissioned, and sent forth again into the world.[434] In order now to illustrate this basic idea of the ascension of the prophet and apostle as background for the interpretation of the Apocalypse of Paul, texts from both Jewish Apocalyptic and Gnosticism will be examined briefly.

---

[432] G. Widengren, The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book (Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1950).

[433] The idea of the ascension as preparation for vocation was wide spread in Shamanism. See Eliade, Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy, (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1964), pp. 34,38,43,49f, 61, 121, 127ff., 190ff., 205ff., 487ff. It was in fact only the motif of the conveying of the Heavenly Tablets (or Book) that Widengren could use to trace the ascension visions back to a Mesopotamian origin. It was just this motif, however, which was absent in the ascension visions of Jewish Apocalyptic and that of the Apostle Dinanukht from Book VI of the Right Ginza. Since the Iranian influence was otherwise found in Jewish Apocalyptic and Mandeanism, perhaps one should look in that direction for the idea of the ascension vision of calling. In this regard, one recalls Nyberg's comment on the question posed by Zarathustra to Ahura in the Gatha of Yasna xliv.8:

Beginning with the ascension vision of the T. Levi 2.5-5.7, the Patriarch dreamed that he was on a high mountain when an angel appeared to him and took him up to the highest heaven. Ascending through the heavens, Levi saw their contents and was told by his angelic psychopomp: "And when thou has ascended thither, thou shalt stand near the Lord, and shalt be His minister, and shalt declare His mysteries to men" (2.10). "Therefore, the Most High hath heard thy prayer, to separate thee from iniquity, and that thou shouldst become to Him a son, and a servant, and a

---

[433] (Contd.) "Der Prophet will die rechte Ekstase, die in ihm eine klare Errinerung an das Gesicht zurücklässt, das er sah, der Worte die er hörte, und der Erkenntnis, die er empfing" (p. 158). The ecstasy involved was a unio mystica with Vohu Manah (p. 155f.), the ecstasy "in der das gottliche Licht des Menschen dem der Gottheit selber begegnet und in der die Götter zum Menschen mit den Gaben des Himmels kommen und ihm Erkenntnis schenken" (p. 157). This was the ecstatic ascension over the Činvat Bridge which made the Prophet a psychopomp who would henceforth himself lead souls on their ascent, both ecstatic and post-mortem, across the Činvat Bridge to heaven (pp. 182-83).

[434] Widengren, The Ascension of the Apostle . . ., pp. 20-21, 32, 58, 68.

minister of His presence. The light of knowledge shalt thou light up in Jacob, and as the sun shalt thou be to all the seed of Israel" (4.2-3). Levi ascended to the highest heaven where he received the revelation of the divine mysteries. From there he was sent forth again into the world as a revealer of the mysteries and the divine gnosis. He was thus an apostle from heaven.

Similarly, Enoch after having ascended into the heavens was brought back to the earth and given one year to reveal to his children the revelation which he had received on his ascension in I Enoch 81.5-6. Then in II Enoch an ascension through the seven heavens was reported in which Enoch was not only shown the contents of the various heavens but was also taught the divine mysteries by God himself. After having received this revelation, Enoch was sent again into the world for thirty days and instructed: "Tell thy sons all that I have told thee, and all that thou hast seen, from the lower heaven up to my throne, and all the troops" (36.1-2 "B"). Carrying out these instructions, Enoch began his disclosure of the mysteries with these words:

> For I am sent forth to you to-day from the Lord's mouth to speak to you all things that are and all that will be till judgment-day, and now, my children, not from my own mouth am I to-day informing you, but from the Lord's mouth" (39.2 "B").

Again the pattern was the same: Enoch was taken up to the highest heaven and given the divine revelation in order that he might go forth again into the world as an apostle from heaven with the words from the Lord's mouth.

With regard to the Gnostics, one reads in Epiphanius that the Archontici had two prophets by the name of Martiades and Marsianos who ascended into heaven and returned to earth after three days.[435] Apparently, these two were also made prophets by virtue of their ascension. These same Gnostics, according to Epiphanius, taught that Seth, the Son of Adam, was caught up to heaven by the Supreme Power and the attending angels of the Good God, where he was taught the mysteries of the lower and upper worlds. After a considerable time he descended again into this world.[436] The books which, according to Epiphanius, the Archontici and Sethians ascribed to Seth probably described the ascension of Seth and the revelation received by him.[437] The Paraphrase of Shem from Nag Hammadi Codex VII reports the ascension of Shem=Seth to "the heights of the Creation, penetrating the light which radiates over all the universe."[438] After describing his ascension, Shem relates the cosmogony which was revealed to him in heaven by Derdekea, the "supreme Mother."[439] In the ascension vision of Book VI of the Right Ginza to which Widengren appealed,[440] one has what was perhaps the best example of the ascension of a Gnostic apostle. In this case, the Mandean Apostle Dīnānūkht, like the Apostle Paul in the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse, received an epiphany vision. Ewath, the Holy Spirit, appeared to Dīnānūkht, who was then taken up to the highest heaven, where he was shown the heavenly world and sent forth again into the world of darkness with these words:[441]

---

[435] _Panarion_ _haer_., 40.7.6 (H., p. 88, 12-14).

[436] _Ibid_., 40.7.1-6 (H. pp. 87.27-88.12).

[437] _Ibid_., 40.7.4-5 (H., p. 88.8-12).

[438] Doresse, p. 147.

> Geh in die Welt der Bösen, an den Ort, der ganz aus Konigreichen besteht. . . . Zieh in die Welt hinaus, rufe den Ruf des Lebens und unterweise Jünger sechzig Jahre und sechzig Monate.[442]

As in the case of Enoch, Dīnānūkht's mission on earth was limited in duration. After it had been completed, he would again ascend to the Light Kingdom to dwell forever.[443] Dīnānūkht too was an apostle from heaven, but, as can be seen from the description of his mission, he went forth from heaven as a Gnostic redeemer calling "the Call of Life" and teaching disciples. Widengren's summary analysis of Dīnānūkht's ascension could serve as an outline of the ascension vision of the prophet and apostle as such.

---

[439] Ibid., pp. 147-50.

[440] Widengren, The Ascension of the Apostle . . . , pp. 62-70.

[441] Ginza R. VI 204.20-211.14 (L., pp. 206-211).

[442] Ginza R. VI. 211 (L., p. 211.3-7).

[443] Ginza R. VI. 211 (L., p. 211.7-12).

> We here meet with the ascension to the highest heaven, the introduction before the highest God, the receiving of visionary knowledge, the sending out with an apostolic message, and the descent.[444]

That the ascension vision in the Apocalypse of Paul was also an ascension in which Paul ascended to the highest heaven in order to be sent forth again into the world as an apostle from heaven shall now be demonstrated.

In the Apocalypse of Paul, the ascension of the Apostle to the highest heaven was narrated. The ascent itself took place in two stages: (1) the ascent to the Ogdoad and (2) the ascent from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven. A two-stage ascension was also experienced by Enoch in II Enoch 1-22. He was first borne aloft to the seventh heaven on the wings of "two very big men."[445] However, "at the end of heaven," i.e. the lower limit of the seventh heaven, he was abandoned by the "two very big men," and Gabriel was dispatched to take him up the rest of the way to the divine presence.[446] Similarly, the ascension of the soul in Poimandres was by two stages, and in this instance the soul ascended first ἐπὶ τῆν ὀγδοατικῆν φύσιν and then after some interval πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.[447] Originally, the ogdoadic sphere was the realm of the fixed stars above the seven planetary spheres. In Gnosticism, however, the Ogdoad was a technical term for the intermediate sphere between the material cosmos and the spiritual world, the Light Kingdom or Pleroma. In Valentinian speculation, the Ogdoad was the realm of Sophia to which the Gnostic soul ascended at death. There it awaited the cosmic eschaton at which time it would mount up on the second stage of its ascension to the Pleroma.[448] In distinction from the other heavens which were called simply such and such heaven, the eighth was called the Ogdoad in the Apocalypse of Paul (23.29-24.1), and this in itself already indicated that the term was also used here in a technical sense.

---

[444] Widengren, The Ascension of the Apostle . . ., p. 68.

[445] II En. 1.4; 3.1.

[446] II En. 21.2-5.

In the Apocalypse, the Ogdoad was already above the material cosmos although it was not itself the highest heaven. First, it was only in passing from the seventh heaven to the Ogdoad that the Apostle had to employ a "sign" to gain passage (23.19-24.1), and this difficulty would suggest that in leaving the seventh heaven the Apostle was leaving the material cosmos. Secondly, from the Ogdoad on, in distinction from the heavens up to the Ogdoad, the Apostle's ascension was no longer obstructed by gates and gatekeepers. Finally, unlike what took place on the ascension up to the Ogdoad, the activity of the Apostle from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven consisted in greeting and being greeted by those whom he met along the way. All of this demonstrates that the realm from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven was unlike the realm below the Ogdoad. In the Apocalypse of Paul as elsewhere in Gnosticism, the Ogdoad was above and outside the lower material cosmos, yet only the outskirts, as it were, of the higher spiritual realm.

---

[447] Poimandres 26 (N.F., I.16.5, 10).

[448] Irenaeus, adv. Haer., I. 5.3; 7.1 (H., I. 45-46, 58-59).

Just as the soul was met with rejoicing upon entering the Ogdoad in Poimandres,[449] Paul was greeted when he arrived in the Ogdoad (24.2-3). It was in fact the Twelve Apostles who greeted him there, and this must be understood as the fulfillment of the promise made by the little child that Paul was going up to the Twelve Apostles who would greet him (19.15-18). For although Paul had seen the Twelve who were escorting him on his ascension, it was first in the Ogdoad that they greeted him. Greeting was an activity which belonged to the spiritual world. Although, the first person plural "we went up" (24.3, 6) was ambiguous, it probably included the Twelve Apostles along with the Holy Spirit and Paul. In this case, the second stage of Paul's ascension was a procession from the Ogdoad to the highest realm as was the ascent of the soul in Poimandres.[450] Having been greeted by the Twelve Apostles in the Ogdoad and having greeted those who were in the ninth heaven, Paul finally arrived in the tenth heaven, the highest and perfect sphere.[451] This was the sphere of the spiritual, and here Paul greeted his "fellow spirits" (24.7-8).

---

[449] Poimandres 26 (N.F., I. 16.6f.).

Behind the clause rather harmlessly translated as "I greeted my fellow spirits," there was a pregnant Gnostic concept. In the first place, the term ϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ was the equivalent of the term ὁμόπνευμα which occurred in the Apocryphon of John as a designation of the ἀπλανης γενεά (an important term in Jewish Apocalyptic) to whom the μυστήριον belonged.[452] the generation which in the tractate On the Origin of the World from Nag Hammadi Codex II was called the πνευματικὴ γενεά in distinction from the ψυχική and the χοική.[453] It was thus his own spiritual generation whom Paul greeted in the tenth heaven. Moreover, in the second place, to greet (ἀσπάζεσθαι) the spiritual generation was to participate in and become one with that generation. In the Gospel of Truth to arrive at gnosis was to ascend to the Father and become one with him by greeting him:

---

[450] Poimandres 26 (N.F., I.16.9ff). On the soul's παραπομπή, see A. J. Festugière, *La Revelation d'Hermes Trismegiste*, Vol. III: *Les Doctrines de l'Âme* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1953), pp. 150-51.

[451] For the concept of ten heavens elsewhere in Gnosticism, see for the Ophites and the followers of Battaï, Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* in H. Pognon *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1898), pp. 213, 223; cited by Cumont in F. Cumont and M. A. Kugener, *Recherches sur le Manicheisme* (Bruxelles, 1908), p. 28, n.2. For the ten heavens in Manichaeism, see A. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 314-20. For a different concept of ten heavens among the Marcosians, see Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, I.17.1 (H., I.165). For the idea of ten heavens in Jewish Apocalyptic, see II Enoch 21.6; 22.1 in the South Russian recension designated "A" in Morfill's translation.

> For (γάρ) the place to which they extend their thoughts, that place is their root, which lifts them up through all heights, even unto the Father. They reach His Head which is repose for them, and they remain there, close to Him, in such a way that (ὡς) they say they have participated in His face through embraces (ἀσπασμός).[454]

The "greeting" (ἀσπάζεσθαι) involved was an embrace, a kiss, through which Paul was united with his own spiritual generation.[455] Paul had arrived at the highest heaven and had entered the godhead. Here the Apocalypse ended. Paul's story did not end here, however, for as it must now be demonstrated from an anlysis of the scene in the seventh heaven, Paul ascended to the highest heaven in order that he might be sent forth again into the world as an apostle.

---

[452] Ap. John CG II, 31.28-31; CG III, 39.15-18. While CG II, 31.30 readϣⲃⲣ ⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅, CG III, 39.16 read ὁμόπνευμα.

[453] CG II, 122.6-9.

[454] CG I, 41.23-24.

[455] On the redemptive kiss which conveys gnosis, see also Gospel of Philip (CG II, 58.26;59.2-6; 63.34-36); I Apoc. James (CG V, 31.2-6; 32.8); II Apoc. James (CG V, 56.14-16).

The first problem to be dealt with in the interpretation of the scene in the seventh heaven (22.23-23.28) was the identity of the ancient one whom Paul encountered there. Upon entering the seventh heaven, Paul was at once confronted by the source of the "great light" which he had seen reflecting down into the sixth heaven (22.17-19). Although the text was quite fragmentary at this point, it was still evident that Paul saw an "aged man" (22.25). This elder, as he was subsequently called (23.1), was described as "white" and "more than the sun" (22.25-29). With this "great light" one should compare the "great light" of the seventh heaven in the Ascension of Isaiah (8.25-26; 9.6) and II Enoch (20.1) and the "Great Glory" of the seventh heaven in the Ascension of Isaiah (9.37; 11.32) and the Testament of Levi (3.4). As in both the Ascension of Isaiah and the Testament of Levi, the expression "Great Glory" was an epithet used in circumlocation for the name of God in I Enoch (14.18-20): "And I looked and saw therein a lofty throne . . . . And the Great Glory sat thereon, and His raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than snow." With regard to his depiction as white and shining more than the sun, the elder of the seventh heaven in the Apocalypse of Paul could, therefore, be identified with God who dwelt in the seventh heaven in Jewish Apocalyptic.

With regard to his depiction as an aged man, Böhlig has suggested the influence of the figure of Cronos-Saturn as the seventh plant.[456] Although this influence need not be ruled out, it was not necessary to explain the depiction of the luminous figure as an elder. For already in I Enoch, where there was no evidence of the influence of the figure of Cronos-Saturn, the "Great Glory" was already represented as an ancient one seated upon his heavenly throne: "And there I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool . . ." (46.1). "In those days I saw the Head of Days when He seated himself upon the throne of His glory . . ." (47.3). "His head [was] white and pure as wool, and His raiment indescribable" (71.10). Here the metaphor of the "Ancient of Days" from Dan. 7.13 had become an epithet which when applied to God led to his portrayal as an elderly man. Hence, the figure of the luminous elder of the seventh heaven in the Apocalypse of Paul may be explained as having derived from the depiction of the Hebrew God as the "Great Glory" and the "Ancient of Days" who sat enthroned in the seventh heaven in Jewish Apocalyptic.

---

[456] Böhlig and Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ., p. 17. See also p. 16f. where Böhlig recognized the influence of the Apocalyptic "Ancient of Days" upon the figure of the elder in the Apocalypse. Cf. Hippol., Elench., VI.32.7 (W., 161.6).

That the elder was also understood as the creator and cosmocrator in the Apocalypse was clear from the statement which ascribed to him the lower creation and the powers thereof: "He turned his [face] downwards down to his creation and the powers (ἐξουσία) which are his" (23.26-28). Again his role as cosmocrator was assumed when he could appeal to the powers at his command: "Look and see these principalities (ἀρχή) and these powers (ἐξουσία)" (23.20-22). At the same time, this representation of the elder of the seventh heaven as commander of the principalities and powers correlated well with the depiction in II Enoch (20.1; 21.1) of the Hebrew God in the seventh heaven as "Lord God of Sabaoth." It appears, therefore, that the imposing figure in the seventh heaven of the Apocalypse of Paul was a composite representation of the Hebrew God as the "Great Glory," the "Ancient of Days," the Creator, and the "Lord God of Sabaoth." The only difficulty with such an identification of the elder with the Hebrew God lay in the fact that the elder cannot have been the highest god because he was surpassed by three higher heavens. Rather than surrendering this identification, however, the obvious conclusion would be that one has to do with the Gnostic abasement of the Hebrew God to the status and role of the evil demiurge and cosmocrator of the material world. That this was indeed the case was indicated not only by the fact that the elder's realm was transcended by three heavens and his creation and powers distinctly described as that which lies below but also by the role which he played with respect to Paul's ascension.

The substance of the scene in the seventh heaven was Paul's interrogation by the elder. Such interrogation scenes wherein the cosmic powers posed certain questions to the ascending soul were common in Gnostic literature and represented part of the general attempt of the cosmic powers to obstruct the escape of the soul to the Light Kingdom. If one were to inquire behind the Gnostic texts for the source of this motif in the history of religions, an obvious place would be the Egyptian religion where the soul of the dead was interrogated by various supernatural beings.[457] By way of example, it will suffice here to point out that in the famous chapter 125 of the Book of the Dead the soul of the deceased was examined first by the gods of the Hall of Judgment with regard to who he was and the journey he had made. After passing this examination, the soul was subjected to an interrogation by the various parts of the door of the hall in which the soul was required to give the names of the various parts of the door. Then the floor asked for the names of the soul's two feet, and finally the guardian of the door interrogated the soul. In this latter case, the soul had to tell why he had come and give the names of the guardian, of Thot, and of Osiris.[458] This of course was nothing but magic and was less similar to the Gnostic interrogation scenes than the magical formulae and names to be recited by the ascending soul before the archons of the various heavens in the Ophite diagram described by Origen.[459]

---

[457] See above, pp. 24, 30.

More closely related to the Gnostic interrogation scenes, in terms of both form and content, were the Orphic gold tablets.[460] Of the eleven tablets, five contained what appears to have been formulae for an interrogation scene. These were the tablet from Pharsalus in Thessaly dating from the fourth century B.C., the tablet from Petelia in Southern Italy from the fourth/third century B.C., and the three tablets from Eleuthernai on Crete from the second century B.C. The texts of the Pharsalus and

---

[458] For the above, see the translation by Budge, *The Book of the Dead*, pp. 198-200.

[459] Origen, c. Celsum, vi. 31; cf. the fragment from Codex Brucianus (Till, pp. 333-34).

[460] See above, pp. 52-54.

Petelia tablets were all but identical and contained a formula which ran as follows:

The Pharsalus tablet (lines 8-9):[461]

> Εἰπεῖν·
>
> Γῆς παῖς εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστ[ερόεντος],
>
> 'Αστέριος ὄνομα·
>
> Say:
>
> I am a child of Earth and of St(arry) Heaven,
>
> By name, Starry.

The Petelia tablet (lines 6-7):[462]

> Εἰπεῖν·
>
> Γῆς παῖς εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
>
> αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γένος οὐράνιον·
>
> Say:
>
> I am a child of Earth and of Starry Heaven,
>
> But my race is of Heaven.

Whether the rubric "Say" in these tablets implied that the formula was the answer to a question and thus part of an interrogation cannot be ascertained, but it was clear that the formula was to be recited to the "guards" (φύλακες) at the Lake of Memory.[463] Moreover, in the second century

---

[461] See above, p. 53, n.197.

[462] See above, p. 53, n.198.

[463] Line 5 of the Pharsalus and Petelia tablets.

B.C. tablets from Eleuthernai the formula did in fact occur in the context of an interrogation scene. The text of the three Eleuthernai tablets was identical and contained the following dialogue:

Τίς δ'ἔσι, πῶ δ'ἔσι,
Γᾶς υἱὸς ἠμὶ καὶ ὠρανῶ ἀστερόεντος[464]
Who are thou? Whence art thou?
I am son of Earth and of Starry Heaven.[465]

The two questions, who and whence, in the tablets from Eleuthernai were questions regarding the identity and origin of the one being questioned. That both questions were in essence one and the same was indicated by the fact that they were both answered with the same answer. That is to say, both the identity and the origin of the speaker were given in the formula: "I am son of Earth and of Starry Heaven." With regard to origin, the speaker had derived from Earth and Heaven, and with regard to identity he was their son. The identity and origin were the same because one's origin determined one's identity. The exact meaning of the claim made in the formula was evident from Hesiod who spoke of οἱ Γῆς τ'ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος.[466] "The ones who were born of Earth and Starry Heaven" were the ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων, "the holy race of the Immortals who exist forever."[467] By asserting that he was a child of Earth and Starry Heaven, the speaker of the formula was claiming to be one of the Immortals, a god. Hence in the Petelia tablet, the speaker claimed that his race (γένος) was of Heaven, and in the tablet from Pharsalus the speaker's name was Starry, an epithet for the heavenly gods. What one has to do with in the formula was the Orphic anthropology according to which the human soul was divine, being buried in the body like a tomb and subjected to the wheel of rebirth until it purified itself and returned to its former home among the gods.[468]

---

[464] Ibid.

[465] Translation by G. Murray, "Critical Appendix. . .," p.661.

[466] Hesiod, Th. v. 106.

All five of the tablets containing the formula were buried with the dead as amulets to assist the soul to escape the wheel of rebirth and proceed on its journey to the dwelling of the gods. The formula itself was thus a formula of passage to be spoken by the soul as signified by the rubric "Say:" on the tablets from Pharsalus and Petelia. That it was to be spoken in the context of an interrogation scene in response to the questions who and whence was made clear by the tablets from Eleuthernai. Here then in the gold tablets one has the motif of an interrogation scene in which the soul on its journey to the other world was questioned with regard to who it was and whence it came. In response, the soul recited the formula of passage in which it affirmed its divine origin and identity by appealing to its divine parentage, the primordial Mother Gaea and Father Ouranos. As it shall be demonstrated below, these were in substance precisely the questions and answers of the Gnostic interrogation scenes.[469] Already it was known that Gnosticism, in the Apocalypse of Paul and in general, adopted the Orphic doctrine of the reincarnation of the soul which was not yet prepared for the return to its immortal dwelling.[470] Over against what might have been termed indirect influence with regard to the doctrine of metensomatosis, however, the fact that the Orphic gold tablets contained not only an interrogation of the soul but an interrogation in which the questions and answers were in substance identical to those of the Gnostic interrogation scenes surely implies that Gnosticism was at this point directly dependent upon Orphism.

---

[467] Ibid., v. 105; cited by Harrison, p. 574.

[468] See above, pp. 44ff.

Turning to the interrogation scene in Gnostic sources, Irenaeus reported that the Marcosians practiced a last rite in which the dying was annointed and given secret formulae of passage for the ascension of the soul.[471] In this case there were two formulae, one to be recited by the soul when it came to the Principalities and Powers and another when it arrived in the presence of the Demiurge. The text of the two formulae ran as follows:

---

[469] See below, p. 188f.

[470] See above, p. 121.

Formula I (to be said to the Principalities and Powers):[472]

1. Ἐγὼ υἱὸς ἀπὸ πατρός, πατρὸς προόντος,
   υἱὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ παρόντι.
2. Ἦλθον πάντα ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀλλότρια, καὶ τὰ ἴδια·
   καὶ οὐκ ἀλλότρια δὲ παντελῶς, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀχαμώθ,
   ἥτις ἐστὶ θήλεια, καὶ ταῦτα ἑαυτῇ ἐποιήσε,
   [κατήγαγε][473] δὲ τὸ γένος ἐκ τοῦ προόντος.
3. καὶ πορεύομαι πάλιν εἰς τὰ ἴδια, ὅθεν ἐλήλυθα.

Formula II (to be said to those around the Demiurge):[474]

---

[471] *adv. Haer.*, I.21.5 (H., I.187-88).

[472] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, I.21.5 (H., I.187).

[473] Following the Latin, *deducit*, instead of the Greek, κατάγω . See below, pp.191-92 , on the Coptic version of this formula from the I Apocalypse of James from Nag Hammadi (Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . .* , pp. 43-44). The Coptic version (I Apocalypse of James 34.5-6) supports the Lat. against the Gr. in the use of the third person rather than the first person singular subject. However, with the third person, the "leading down" of the race would have been that accomplished by Achamoth at her fall. Hence, instead of the present tense of the Latin, *deducit*, the Coptic correctly read ⲈⲤⲈⲒⲚⲈ ⲈⲠⲈⲤⲎⲦ , which, following a I Perfect, would have translated κατήγαγε.

[474] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, I.21.5 (H., I.187f.).

Σκεῦός εἰμι ἔντιμον . . . .
    ἐγὼ οἶδα ἐμαυτόν,
    καὶ γινώσκω ὅθεν εἰμί,
    καὶ ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὴν ἄφθαρτον Σοφίαν,
        ἥτις ἐστιν ἐν τῷ Πατρί . . . .
    ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπικαλοῦμαι . . . τὴν μητέρα.

The text omitted from Formula II had to do with the fall of Achamoth, the lower Sophia, and her giving birth to those around the Demiurge. Achamoth's creation of the material cosmos was also the subject of the second paragraph of Formula I in spite of the fact that it began as if to tell why the soul had come into the cosmos. This material had to do, therefore, with the origin and nature of the cosmos and the cosmic powers. That which dominated the formulae, however, was the remaining material.

The substance of the formulae of passage was stated in lines 2 and 3 of Formula II: "I know myself, and I know whence I am." This, as it will be recalled, was also the substance of the Orphic formula of passage as expressed in the questions who and whence in the tablets from Eleuthernai. There the answer was given in terms of the origin and divine parentage of the soul. Here also in paragraph 1 of Formula I, the soul affirmed that it was a son from the Pre-existent Father, in Formula II, the soul called upon its Mother Sophia. In short, just as in the case of the Orphic formulae, the soul in the Marcosian formulae of passage made affirmations which answered the questions who and whence in terms of its divine origin and divine parentage. In addition, however, the Marcosian formulae (Formula I, para. 3) made an affirmation which answered the question whither: "And I am going again unto my own from whence I have come."

It may now be further demonstrated that Formula I of the Marcosians occurred almost word for word in the I Apocalypse of James (CG V, 33.15-34.18)[475] and that it occurred there in the context of an interrogation in which it supplied the answers to questions posed to the soul by the "guard."[476] In order to demonstrate that the two texts employed the same material, the questions and answers were quoted from the I Apocalypse of James and the Greek text of the same answers were given from the Marcosian formula. To further secure the demonstration, the German translation by Böhlig was employed for the I Apocalypse of James and the interrogation was structured according to the three-fold division of Formula I of the Marcosians.

---

[475] Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . .* , pp. 43-44.

[476] The inquisitor was one of the three *telōnai* who seized the soul (CG V, 33.5-11). At CG V, 33.14 he was designated a "guard" (PE PE =φύλαξ). Cf. the φύλακες to whom the formula of passage was spoken in the Orphic tablets, above p.183, and the ἐγρήγοροι of I En. 1.5; 10.9; T. Reuben 5.6,7; T. Naphtali 3.5.

1.

Q. "'Wer bist du order (ἤ) woher bist du?'"

A. "'Ich bin ein Sohn und ich stamme vom Vater.'"

ἐγὼ υἱὸς ἀπὸ πατρός,

Q. "'Was für ein Sohn bist du? Und von welchem stammst du?'"

A. "'Ich stamme vom prä[existenten] Vater,

πατρὸς προόντος,

ein Sohn aber (δέ) (bin ich), der von Präexistenten ist.'"

υἱὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ παρόντι.

At this point the text of the I Apoc. James was damaged but began again at 34.2 with the answer to a preceding question.

2.

Q. . . . .

A. "'Es ist überhaupt nicht fremd,

καὶ οὐκ ἀλλότρια δὲ παντελῶς,

sondern (ἀλλά) von Achamoth, d.i. dem Weibe,

ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀχαμώθ, ἥτις ἐστὶ θήλεια,

stammt es.

Und dies hat sie geschaffen,

καὶ ταῦτα ἑαυτῇ ἐποίησε,

als sie dies Geschlecht (γένος) hinabbrachte

⌊κατήγαγε⌋[477] δὲ τὸ γένος

aus dem Präexistenten.'"

ἐκ τοῦ προόντος.

The answer continued in the Coptic text without parallel in Formula I of the Marcosians but with material similar to that dealing with Achamoth in Formula II. At the conclusion of the answer, another question was posed.

3.

Q. "'Wohin wirst du gehen?'"

A. "'Zu dem Ort, von wo ich gekommen bin, dorthin werde ich wieder gehen.'"

καὶ πορεύομαι πάλιν εἰς τὰ ἴδια, ὅθεν ἐλήλυθα.

From this comparison it was clear that the Coptic text of the answers was a translation of the same Greek text known to Irenaeus.[478] However, since it is highly unlikely that the Father compressed the dialogue into a monologue by separating the answers from the questions, the dialogue form provided by the I Apocalypse of James may be regarded as a secondary development of the monologue formula known to Irenaeus. Obviously, by comparing the Greek text a translation of the Coptic could be rendered in which the similarity to the Greek would be even more apparent and the lacuna at the bottom of p. 33 could be reconstructed.[479]

---

[477] See above, n. 473.

[478] For the material parallel to Marcosian Formula II, see I Apoc. James CG V, 35.1-25.

What was of more importance for the present discussion was the fact that the I Apocalypse of James provided an interrogation scene in which the ascending soul was asked basically three questions by the cosmic powers. Who are you? Whence did you come? Whither are you going? The answer was: I am a son who comes from the pre-existent Father, and I return whence I came. These questions and answers must now be compared with those from other Gnostic interrogation scenes.

Logion 50 of the Nag Hammadi Gospel of Thomas (CG II, 41.30-42.7) was a dialogue which consisted of three sets of questions and answers:

1. If they say to you:
   "From where have you originated?",
   say to them:
   "We have come from the Light, where the Light has originated through itself. It [stood] and it revealed itself in their image (εικών)".
2. If they say to you:
   "(Who) are you?",

---

[479] The text from Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*., I. 21.5, was not utilized by Kasser, p. 83, in his reconstruction of these lines.

say:

"We are His sons and we are the elect of the Living Father."

3. If they ask you:

"What is the sign of your Father in you?",

say to them:

"It is a movement and a rest" (ἀνάπαυσις).

Obviously this was not simply a dialogue but an interrogation. That it was, moreover, an interrogation of the ascending soul was indicated by the fact that the preceding line ended with a reference to the ascent of the soul to the Light Kingdom. Logion 49 (CG II, 41.28-30) concluded with "you shall find the Kingdom; because you come from it, (and) you shall go there again" (- πάλιν), and logion 50 began: "Jesus said: If [or when] they say to you . . . ." The impression was that the "if [or when] they say to you" referred back to the "you shall go there again," i.e. that the interrogation was to be experienced on the return of the soul to the Light Kingdom. In this case, the inquisitors were the cosmic powers who would subject the ascending soul to the following interrogation. That this was indeed the case was further substantiated by the fact that the questions and answers were in substance identical to those of the other Gnostic interrogation scenes.

Whereas in the interrogation scene in the I Apocalypse of James the order of the questions was who and whence, in the Gospel of Thomas the order was reversed. The first question was the whence question, and the answer was "from the Light," i.e. the Light Kingdom. The additional material in the answer to the first question was parallel to the myth of Achamoth's fall and creation of the cosmos in paragraph 2 of the interrogation scene of the I Apocalypse of James. The second question was the who question, and the answer was that they were sons and elect of the Living Father. The third question, while posed in terms of the sign of the Father in the children, actually raised both the whence and whither questions. For the answer, "a movement and a rest" (ἀνάπαυσις), referred to the movement away from and the return to the Light. In sum, the interrogation dialogue of the Gospel of Thomas gave the same three questions and answers as the interrogation scene of the I Apocalypse of James: (1) Who? A son of the Father. (2) Whence? From the Light. (3) Whither? To the place of rest, i.e. to the Light.

In the Gospel of Mary (BG, 15.1-17.7) an ascension was reported in which a soul was interrogated progressively by four different powers (ἐξουσία). That which was of importance for the present discussion was the interrogation by the fourth and last power, the seven-fold Wrath (ὀργή) who was composed of seven Gnostic vices (BG, 16. 13-17.7).[480]

They questioned the soul:

Whence do you come, Man-killer?
Or (ἤ) whither are you going, Place-deserter?

Then answered the soul (ψυχή) saying:

[1] That which seized me has been killed,
and that which surrounded me has been deserted,
[2] and my desire (ἐπιθυμία) has ended,
and my ignorance has perished.
[3] Into a world (κόσμος), I was loosed from a
world (κόσμος),
and into a type (τύπος), from a higher type
(τύπος),
[4] and into the bond of forgetfulness[481]
which exists for (πρός-) a time.
From this time I shall attain unto the rest
(ἀνάπαυσις)
in the time (χρόνος) of the moment (καιρός)
of the aeon (αἰών) in Silence.[482]

---

[480] A fresh English translation was here attempted. That by E.R. Hardy in R.M. Grant, *Gnosticism* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), pp. 65-68, was not satisfactory.

[481] Coptic, BϢE = λήθη, ὕπνος. Hardy's, p. 67, "impotence of knowledge" was clearly a translation of Till's "Erkenntnisunfähigkeit" rather than the Coptic.

[482] Coptic KAPΩϤ = σιγή.

Having found it in the other interrogation scenes, one wonders why the who question did not appear here. Perhaps, the answer lies in the fact that the inquisitors themselves answered the who question by providing the soul with the epithets "Man-killer" and "Place-deserter." In any event, the two questions posed to the soul were the whence and the whither questions. As the outline made clear, the answer fell into four parts with two lines in each part. In parts 1 and 2, the soul interpreted the epithets given it by the inquisitors, and in parts 2 and 4 the questions whence and whither were answered. According to part 1, the soul as Man-killer had killed that which seized it, and as Place-deserter it had deserted that which had surrounded it. The body which had seized and surrounded the soul had been killed and deserted. Part 2 pointed then to the death of the desire and ignorance which had kept the soul imprisoned in the body and the cosmos. In answering the whence question, part 3 affirmed that the soul had come into this world from another world as into a lower type from a higher type. This characterization of the lower world was continued in the first line of part 4 by describing the world as a bond of forgetfulness and something which is temporal, i.e. bound by time. Then in the second line the soul answered the whither question by claiming that it had escaped the temporal world and was departing to the eternal aeon of Silence, the higher cosmos from whence it had come, wherein it would find rest (ἀνάπαυσις) as in the answer to the whither question in the Gospel of Thomas.

To summarize, four texts have been examined in which the ascending soul addressed the cosmic powers with the purpose of gaining passage beyond them to the Light Kingdom. Of these texts, all were dialogues in which the soul was interrogated by the cosmic powers with the exception of that from Irenaeus which was a formula of passage containing the answers to the questions posed by the cosmic powers in the interrogation scene of the I Apocalypse of James. The same answers were given to the same questions in all four of the texts. They had to do with who the soul was, whence it came, and whither it was going. Only in the Gospel of Mary was the who question omitted, but here the same purpose was served by the epithets which were given the soul by the cosmic powers and then interpreted by the soul, i.e. they identified the soul.

With regard to the who question, in the Marcosian formula, the I Apocalypse of James, and the Gospel of Thomas, the answer was given in terms of divine parentage. The soul was a son of the divine Father. In the Gospel of Mary, the answer was given in terms of the alien nature of the soul who slays and abandons the body and cosmos.

Here too, therefore, the divine identity of the soul was affirmed in a negative manner. With regard to the whence question, the answer in the Marcosian formula and the I Apocalypse of James was that the soul had come from the Father. Hence, as in the case of the Orphic formula, the identity and origin of the soul were the same, i.e. a son from divine parentage. In the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Mary, however, the whence of the soul was affirmed in terms of place rather than parentage, but the intention was the same, i.e. to affirm the divine origin of the soul. According to Thomas the soul had come from the Light, and according to Mary it had come from the higher cosmos. In either case it was from the Light Kingdom, the world of deity. With regard to the whither question, in the Marcosian formula and the I Apocalypse of James, the soul claimed that it was going again ὅθεν ἐλήλυθα . Thus, the whence and the whither of the soul were one and the same. The soul had come from the Pre-existent Father and would return to him. In the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Mary, the whither of the soul was the rest (ἀνάπαυσις) in the Light and the higher cosmos from whence it had come. Again therefore, the whence and the whither were identical, viz. the Light "Kingdom; because you come from it, (and) you shall go there again (πάλιν)."[483]

---

[483] Gospel of Thomas (CG II, 41.28-30).

Since the who and the whence of the soul were seen to be identical above, it may now be said that the who, the whence, and the whither were all one and the same. For the soul was a son of the Father, had come from the Father, and would return to the Father. Or in terms of place, the soul was a son of the Father from the Father's Kingdom to which it would return. This identity of the who, whence, and whither of the soul signified that one's being and destiny were determined by one's origin.

In the three questions, who, whence, and whither, and their answers one has the Gnostic myth of the descending-ascending soul: its pre-existence, its fall into the cosmos, and its return to its prior estate. While thus articulating Gnostic anthropology, the answers to these questions at the same time constituted the essence of *gnosis*, thus signifying the Gnostic identification of anthropology and epistemology: knowledge was self-knowledge. Hence, in the Acts of Thomas (chap. 15), *gnosis* was defined in terms of the being, or identity, of the soul as knowledge of "who I was, who I am now, and how (I came to be thus), in order that I might become again what I was."[484] In the Gospel of Truth it was defined in terms of the origin and destiny of the soul: "The gnostic thus knows whence he came and whither he is going" (CG I, 22.13-15). Then in the Excerpta ex Theodoto (78.2) it was defined in terms of both being and origin = destiny as "gnosis of who we were, what we became; where we were, wherein we were thrown; whither we hasten, whence we are redeemed; what birth is, what rebirth is." Finally, it will be recalled from the Marcosian Formula II that gnosis could be defined in terms of self-knowledge and self-origin: "I know myself, and I know whence I am."

---

[484] L.B., II.2, 121.12-13.

When, therefore, the ascending soul replied to the who, whence, and whither questions of the cosmic powers, its answers constituted at once the Gnostic myth of the descending-ascending soul and the essence of gnosis. Since the questions elicited these particular answers, the questioning and answering, i.e. the interrogation scene, could be construed as an imitation of a Gnostic catechesis. What this means for the understanding of the interrogation scene is that the answers given by the soul were not simply magical formulae designed to overcome the cosmic inquisitors. They were at the same time a recitation of gnosis, and this means that the soul was saved from the cosmic powers and enabled to ascend to the Light Kingdom not by magic but by gnosis.

By the preceding investigation of the interrogation scene in other Gnostic texts, a basis has been attained for the interpretation of the dialogue which took place in the seventh heaven between the elder and Paul in the Apocalypse of Paul (23.2-17). That dialogue may be outlined as follows:

1.

Q. "Whither will you go, Paul, who is blessed and was set apart from his mother's womb?"

A. "I will go to the place (τόπος) from which I came."

2.

Q. "Whence are you?"

A. "I will go down to the world (κόσμος) of the dead in order that I might lead captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία) which was led captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) in the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία) of Babylon."

From the questions asked it was at once apparent that the text had to do with the Gnostic interrogation scene. As in the Gospel of Mary, the explicit questions were whither and whence, while the who question was replaced by the identification supplied by the inquisitor in his first question, in this case by calling Paul by name and identifying him as the one "who was blessed and set apart from his mother's womb." As a dialogue in which one who was ascending was asked the very same questions asked by the cosmic powers in the Gnostic interrogation scenes, the dialogue between Paul and the elder in the Apocalypse of Paul was beyond doubt as interrogation scene in which the elder as the inquisitor represented the cosmic powers who sought to obstruct the ascension.

If the dialogue could thus be identified as a Gnostic interrogation scene on the basis of the questions posed, an examination of the answers given to those questions will disclose a radical departure from the Gnostic model. The answer to the first, i.e. the whence, question was almost verbally identical to that of the Marcosian Formula I and the I Apocalypse of James (34.17-18).

Marc. F.	πορεύομαι πάλιν	εἰς τὰ ἴδια,	ὅθεν ἐλήλυθα
Ap. Paul	ⲈΪⲚⲀⲂⲰⲔ	ⲈⲠⲦⲞⲠⲞⲤ	ⲚⲦⲀΪⲈⲒ ⲚϨⲎⲦϤ·
I Ap. J.		ⲈⲠⲘⲀ	ⲈⲦⲀΪⲈⲒ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲘⲘⲀⲨ
	ⲈΪⲚⲀⲂⲰⲔ ⲞⲚ ⲈⲘⲀⲨ·		

In all three cases the whither of the soul was not specified but was identified instead with the whence. What was involved in this manner of answering was the principle of the identity of the whence and whither based on the myth of the descending-ascending soul. To quote the answer from the Apocalypse of Paul: "I will go to the place (τόπος) from whence I came forth." Whither I go and whence I came are one and the same place, topos. This proves beyond all doubt that the author of the Apocalypse knew and employed the principle of the identity of the whence and whither. In fact, it was precisely this principle which permitted Paul to answer the second question, i.e. the whence question, in terms of his whither: "I will go . . . ." Because the whence and whither were one and the same topos, Paul could identify his whence by identifying his whither.

Having identified the whence and whither as one and the same topos in the first answer, the question became, What was that topos? This then was the second question of the inquisitor: "Whence are you?" From the other interrogation scenes as well as the myth of the descending-ascending soul, one would have expected Paul to answer this question by designating the Light Kingdom of the Father as the topos from which he came and to which he was going. For in the I Apocalypse of James, the answer to the whence question was "from the Father," in the Gospel of Thomas "from the Light," and in the Gospel of Mary the whence of the soul was the world of the higher type. It represented, therefore, a radical departure from the Gnostic model when Paul identified the topos of his whence and whither not with the Light Kingdom but with the world of the dead. For this means that while he knew and employed the principle of the identity of the whence and whither, the author of the Apocalypse used it in a radically different way. Already Böhlig sensed that something was wrong with Paul's answer and sought to correct it by emending the text.[485] As it shall be seen, however, the difficulty in Paul's answer did not arise from a text-critical problem but from the intention of the author. That is to say, in thus editing the Gnostic model by identifying the _topos_ of the whence and whither not with the Light Kingdom but with the world of the dead, the author of the Apocalypse gave expression to his interpretation of the ascension of Paul. Only by taking this redaction seriously can one discover the intention of the author and the particular nature and meaning of the Apocalypse.

An indication of what the author intended by thus identifying Paul's whence and whither with the world of the dead may be discovered in the first question of the interrogation scene. The striking thing about that question was the fact that it was couched in a quotation of the very same text cited by the little child in the opening epiphany scene, _viz_. Gal. 1.15f. There it was cited in order to identify the little child with the Risen Christ as the Son of God who appeared to Paul in Gal. 1. 15f. and to identify the Apocalypse itself with the vision of calling reported by Paul in Gal. 1.11-17.[486] That is to say, Gal. 1.16 was the textual point of departure for the Apocalypse, and combined with II Cor. 12.2-4 it provided the textual basis for the interpretation of Paul's vision of calling as an ascension vision of calling. One would expect, therefore, that the citation of Gal. 1.16 again in the interrogation scene signaled the author's return to the interpretation of Paul's vision of calling. Indeed, the sign of the author's interpretative activity was already present in the manner in which Gal. 1.16 was cited.

---

[485] Böhlig and Labib, _Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . ._, pp. 18, n. 4; 25, n. to 23.13, suggested changing the tense of the verb "to go" from the future to a past tense.

If it was striking to find Gal. 1.16 cited at all in the interrogation scene, it was even more striking to find it cited there in a form different from that in the epiphany scene. Whereas in the earlier instance only the phrase, "from his mother's womb," was present, in the interrogation scene one finds the longer phrase, "set apart from his mother's womb." In short, the verb, "to set apart," was omitted on the first occasion and included on the second. Assuming that the variation was intentional, why was the operative verb omitted there and included here? As it was demonstrated above in the discussion of the citation in the epiphany scene, the phrase, "from the mother's womb," ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός , was originally a predestination formula.[487] Combined with the verb, "to set apart," ἀφορίζειν , at Gal. 1.16, Paul employed it to assert that he had been set apart, or consecrated, from birth for the apostolic office, i.e. that he had been predestined to be an apostle. The Coptic form of the phrase in the Apocalypse, ⲠⲞⲢϪ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϪⲒⲚ ⲚϩⲎⲦⲤ ⲚⲦⲈϤⲘⲀⲀⲨ , can be translated "set apart from his mother's womb on" and interpreted likewise to mean that Paul had been consecrated from birth, or predestined. On the other hand the Coptic phrase also admits of being understood simply as a metaphor for birth in the sense of being separated, or extracted, from the mother's womb. As it shall be demonstrated, the author of the Apocalypse did not interpret the phrase in its former and original meaning as a predestination formula but in the latter sense as a metaphor of birth. For it was precisely this understanding of the phrase which made him omit the verb "to separate" from the citation of Gal. 1.16 in the epiphany scene and include it in the citation in the interrogation scene.

---

[486] See above, pp. 145ff., 153ff.

In the text previously cited from the Excerpta ex Theodoto (78.2), a series of four antitheses were given: "Who we were, what we became; where we were, wherein we were thrown; whither we hasten, whence we are redeemed; what birth is, what rebirth is." That which was opposed in each of these antitheses was being in the Light Kingdom and being in the world. Hence, in the fourth antithesis "birth" should be understood as being born into the world and "rebirth" as being born into the Light Kingdom. Then as an elaboration upon this opposition of birth into the world and rebirth into the Light Kingdom, Excerpta 80.1 defined birth as εις θάνατον ἄγεσθαι καὶ εις κόσμον which was set over against rebirth through Christ as εις ζωὴν μετατίθεσθαι, εις ὀγδοάδα. Just as birth was a being led into the world and into death, rebirth was a being translated out of the world and death into life and the Ogdoad, the eighth heaven. In short, the ascension of the soul was its rebirth from the material world into the Ogdoad. Implied in this formulation was the comparison of the material world with a womb from which the ascending soul was expelled. This very comparison was explicitly made by the Sethians who claimed that "the heaven and earth have a form resembling a womb" (μήτρα)[488] and described the descent of Christ into the world to redeem the enslaved particles of nous as his entrance into the impure cosmic womb: ὁ ἄνωθεν τοῦ φωτὸς τέλειος λόγος . . . εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἀκάθαρτον μήτραν. . . .[489] Then in the Mandean literature one finds the ascent of the soul at death described as the separation of the soul from the womb of the material world.[490] Similarly, in the II Apocalypse of James from the same Nag Hammadi Codex V in which the Apocalypse of Paul occurred, the ascension of both Christ and James was described as a going forth from the womb of the world. After having promised James that he (James) would become again what he was before he left the Light Kingdom, the Risen Christ kissed him and imparted to him the revelation (56.11ff.) Then as he was about to depart, he said to James: "Understand and know all in order that you may go forth from this womb [Coptic, ϨΗ] even as I"(57.6-8).[491]

---

[487] See above, pp. 143-45.

---

[488] Hippol., Elench., V. 19.11 (W., p. 118.12f.). Professor James M. Robinson calls my attention to the term "womb" in the paraphrase of Shem from Nag Hammadi.

Against this background it was clear that Paul's reference to his being "set apart from his mother's womb" in the context of his vision of calling in Gal. 1.11-17 could and probably would have been understood in Gnostic circles as his spiritual rebirth from the womb of the world by an ecstatic ascension. Since the author of the Apocalypse clearly interpreted Gal. 1.11-17 as an ecstatic ascension by combining it with II Cor. 12.2-4, it was all the more likely that he interpreted the phrase, "set apart from his mother's womb," as Paul's rebirth by ascension from the matrix of the cosmos. That he did so interpret the phrase was further substantiated by the fact that he reserved the phrase for the citation of Gal. 1.16 in the seventh heaven where Paul was at the outer limits of the material world and before the door to the Ogdoad, that is, so to speak, in the moment of birth.

---

[489] *Ibid*., V. 19.20 (W., p. 120.16-17).

[490] See E. Drower, *The Haran Gawaita and the Baptism of Hibil-Ziwa* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953), p. 39, n. 5. E. Drower, *The Secret Adam: A Study of Nasoraean Gnosis* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 22, 66ff., esp. p. 74. Cited by Kurt Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), II, 274, n. 5, who cited as further evidence E. Drower, *The Thousand and Twelve Questions* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), I.2, secs. 278ff.

[491] Almost certainly an allusion to the claim that Jesus and James were brothers. Cf. II Ap. James 50.11-23.

To summarize, it was discovered that the author employed the Gnostic principle of the identity of the whence and whither in the interrogation dialogue but that he employed it in a radically different manner by identifying the common whence and whither with the land of the dead instead of the Light Kingdom. In the effort to discover the intention behind this redaction of the Gnostic model, the first question of the dialogue was examined. Since that question was couched in a quotation from Gal. 1.16 it was conjectured that the interrogation scene like the epiphany scene, in which the same text was cited, was somehow related to the interpretation of Paul's vision of calling from Gal. 1.11-17. Since, moreover, the citation of Gal. 1.16 in the interrogation scene added the verb "to set apart" it was thought that this addition to the quotation should reflect the particular interest the author had in mind in using Gal. 1.16 in the interrogation scene. In the study of the phrase, "set apart from his mother's womb," it was seen that in Gnostic circles this phrase could have been understood as referring to the rebirth from the womb of the world and that this particular interpretation would explain why the author reserved the phrase for the seventh heaven where Paul was in the moment of being born by ascension from the womb of the world. What remains is to demonstrate how this phrase so interpreted was operative in the remainder of the interrogation dialogue and how it was therein employed to interpret Paul's ascension. In accomplishing this task, the intention behind the author's redaction of the Gnostic principle of the identity of the whence and whither will at the same time be explained.

By articulating the first question of the dialogue through the quotation of Gal. 1.16 the author oriented the interrogation scene to Paul's vision of calling. It was not Gal. 1.16 as a whole, however, but only the phrase, "set apart from his mother's womb," which was chosen to interpret and be interpreted by the dialogue. It was with this phrase that the first question ended, and it was to the question thusly framed that Paul responded. That is to say, Paul's answer was determined by the way in which the question was posed. "Whither will you go, Paul, who was blessed and separated from his mother's womb?" "I will go to the place (τόπος) from whence I came." What was the *topos* from whence he had come and to which he would go? It was already specified in the preceding question, *viz*. "his mother's womb." Paul had come forth from the womb of the cosmos and to it he would return. That this was the case was then made absolutely clear when in response to the second question, the *whence* question, Paul answered, "I *will* go down to the world (κόσμος) of the dead . . . ." For here, as in 20.19f., "the world of the dead" was not the subterranean Hades of a three-story universe but the present world viewed under the aspect of Hades.[492] The womb from which Paul had been separated and the cosmos of the dead to which he would go were one and the same *topos*, this present material world.

---

[492] See above, pp.93-96, n.308. Against Böhlig in Böhlig and Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen . . .*, p. 18 who thought the author of the Apocalypse also used the three-story world view and concluded that "wo das Totenreich sich befindet . . . ist kaum zu bestimmen."

From beginning to end the dialogue was consistent. The Gnostic principle of the identity of the whence and whither was employed, but contrary to Gnostic usage the common whence and whither was not the Light Kingdom but the lower cosmos. By couching the opening question in the phrase from Gal. 1.16 the interrogation was oriented to Paul's vision of calling, and this particular orientation demanded the divergent usage of the principle of the identity of the whence and whither. It was not the doctrine of the return of the soul to its place of origin in the Light Kingdom but the Apostle's ascension vision of calling which provided the theme of the dialogue, and for this reason the identical whence and whither was not the Light Kingdom but the world from which Paul was reborn by ascension and to which he would return as an apostle.

Paul would indeed ascend to the highest and perfect realm, the tenth heaven, and there be reunited with his fellow spirits. Having thus been empowered and commissioned, however, "I will go down to the world (κόσμος) of the dead in order that I may lead captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία), which was led captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν) in the captivity (αἰχμαλωσία) of Babylon." With this, Paul's descent and mission to the world of the dead was consciously compared with that of Christ in Eph.

4.8-10. For there it was said that it was Christ, who κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς, who also ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν . Just as Christ descended into the lower parts, i.e. the earth, and led captivity captive, Paul would also descend to the cosmic Hades in order to lead captivity captive.[493] As this text demonstrates, the author of the Apocalypse understood the Apostle Paul to have been nothing less than a second Christ, a second redeemer. It was for this purpose that the Apocalypse was written: To portray the Apostle Paul as one who had ascended to the highest heaven and having there been empowered and commissioned was sent forth again into the world as an apostle-redeemer. For this reason, the Apocalypse of Paul may be appropriately described as an ascension vision of calling.

---

[493] On the descent of Christ in Eph. 4.8-10 into "the lower part" as a descent to the earth, see also H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Dusseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), p. 192. For the Gnostic-Redeemer who descends to the earth identified with *Amente*, the Egyptian Hades, see Ap. John, CG II, 30.15-31.28 (Giversen, pp. 105-107). On the descending-ascending redeemer who leads up those below, see John 3.13-15; 12.32. Cf. Ode Sol. 10.1-4; 17.

CHAPTER VI

THE APOCALYPSE AND THE GNOSTIC VIEW OF PAUL

In this chapter an attempt will be made (1) to relate the Apocalypse to other Gnostic speculation on the revelation received by Paul and (2) to relate the view of Paul's apostleship set forth in the Apocalypse with the Gnostic view of Paul.

The earliest evidence of the existence of a document which may have been an interpretation of Paul's ascension in II Cor. 12.2-4 was provided by a quotation from Origen preserved in the Nomocanon of Barhebraeus, the thirteenth century Syrian encyclopedist.

> The opinions of the Epistle to the Hebrews are the Apostle Paul's but the style is someone's who recalled and wrote down those things which the Apostle said. And there are those who say this was Clement and others that it was Luke. But in the whole church in which it is ⟨found⟩, it should be accepted as Paul's, but the Apocalypse of Paul with other apocalypses and the Teaching of the Apostles and the Epistle (manuscript reads plural erroneously) of Barnabas and Tobit and the Shepherd and Son of Sirach are accepted in the church. But many do not accept the Book of the Shepherd and the Apocalypse of John.[494]

---

[494] Nomocanon, vii.9 (Bedjan, pp. 104-105), Syriac text with the above translation by R. Casey, "The Apocalypse of Paul," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXXIV (January, 1933), pp. 26-27.

Since according to this quotation the Apocalypse of Paul known to Origen was "accepted in the church," it would appear unlikely that it was identical with the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul from Nag Hammadi. On the other hand, Epiphanius reported that there was a document in circulation among the Cainites and Gnostics entitled 'Αναβατικὸν Παύλου .[495] According to Epiphanius, the Gnostic Ascension of Paul was based on II Cor. 12.2-4 and purported to contain the "inexpressible things" (ἄρρητα ῥήματα) which Paul saw and heard in the third heaven.[496] If this description were correct, the Gnostic *Anabaticon* could also not be identified with the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse. For the latter not only did not mention the "inexpressible things" of the third heaven but reported instead the ascent of the Apostle to the tenth heaven. Epiphanius may have been mistaken in his description, however, for there was earlier evidence of Gnostic speculation which had already extended the ascension of the Apostle beyond the third heaven.

In arguing against the repudiation of the Creator involved in the Gnostic claim that those who were spiritual ascended beyond the psychic Demiurge to the Pleroma,

---

[495] Epiphanius, *Panarion haer*., 38.2.5 (H., II, 64).

[496] *Ibid*.

Irenaeus appealed to II Cor. 12.2-4 to prove that Paul had ascended only to the third heaven where he saw and heard spiritual things.[497] In doing so, however, he was forced to acknowledge that the Gnostics had already protected themselves against this argument by extending Paul's ascension beyond the third heaven even to the spiritual realm above the Demiurge: "Si eorum quae super Demiurgum dicuntur mysteriorum speculator et auditor inciperet fiere, quemadmodum audent quidam dicere."[498] Regardless of what may have been intended by the phrase, "begun to be," this text demonstrated that Irenaeus knew of Gnostic speculation on II Cor. 12.2-4 which extended by some means Paul's ascension to the realm above the Demiurge. How this extension was accomplished exegetically may now be illustrated from the Naassenes.

According to Hippolytus, the Naassenes also participated in the speculation on II Cor. 12.2-4. In a section of Naassene exegesis whose theme was the ascent of the spiritual man, περὶ τῆς ἀνόδου αὐτοῦ , Ps. 24.7-9 with its figure of the King of Glory entering the everlasting gates was employed as the text.[499] "The perfect man is not saved except he be born again [ἀναγεννᾶσθαι] by entering this gate [διὰ ταύτης εἰσελθὼν τῆς πύλης],"[500] and "those who do not enter it remain dead," for entering this gate is "the resurrection [ἀνάστασις]."[501] This gate, which to enter was thus both rebirth and resurrection, was the gate of heaven and the house of God seen by Jacob in Gen. 28.7, 17.[502] As such it was "where the Good God alone dwells, into which shall enter, they say, neither the impure, nor the *psychikos*, nor the *sarkikos*, but is reserved for the *pneumatikoi* alone."[503] In short it was the gate to the Light Kingdom unto which the spiritual man ascended and was thereby reborn and resurrected. It was just this gate which "Paul the Apostle knew," according to the Naassenes.[504] He referred to it in I Cor. 2.7, "setting it ajar in a mystery," and it was through this gate that he ascended into Paradise and heard "unspeakable words" in II Cor. 12.4.[505] As in the case of the unnamed Gnostics of Irenaeus, the Naassenes of Hippolytus extended the ascension of the Apostle beyond the third heaven to the spiritual realm above the Demiurge. In this case, however, it was clear that the extension of the ascension was accomplished by distinguishing exegetically between the third heaven of II Cor. 12.3 and the Paradise of 12.4 as evidenced by the elaboration of the places visited by Paul from two to three: ἕως δευτέρου καὶ τρίτου οὐρανοῦ εις τὸν παράδεισον αὐτόν . . . .[506]

---

[497] Irenaeus, adv. Haer., II.30.7 (H., I, 365).

[498] Ibid.

[499] Hippol., Elench., V.8.18-45 (W., III, 92-97).

---

[500] *Ibid*., V. 8.21 (W., III, 93.4-5).

[501] *Ibid*., V. 8.24 (W., III, 93.18-20).

[502] *Ibid*., V. 8.44 (W., III, 97.12-15).

[503] *Ibid*.

[504] *Ibid*., V. 8.25 (W., III, 93.23-27).

[505] *Ibid*.

In summary, one has evidence of speculation on the revelation received by Paul dating back to the end of the second century. That this speculation was embodied in documents ascribed to the Apostle was evidenced by Origen and Epiphanius, and in the latter case the document was a Gnostic interpretation of II Cor. 12.2-4. That the Gnostic speculation on II Cor. 12.2-4 extended the Apostle's ascension to the spiritual realm above the Demiurge was attested by Irenaeus and the Naassene exegesis preserved by Hippolytus. The Apocalypse of Paul from Nag Hammadi belonged to this Gnostic speculation on the ascension of Paul.

With regard to the Gnostic view of Paul's apostleship, it was already evident from the Naassene exegesis and the unnamed Gnostics of Irenaeus cited above that the Gnostics appealed to Paul's ascension in II Cor. 12 for their doctrine of the ascent of the soul. The Naassenes identified the "inexpressible things" of II Cor. 12.4 with the "revealed mystery" of I Cor. 2.7,[507] and Basilides added to this the wisdom of the Spirit in I Cor. 2.13.[508] According to Basilides, the revelation referred to by Paul in these three texts was identical to his (Basilides') Gnostic doctrine.[509] Hence, the Gnostics not only speculated upon the revelation received by Paul but they also appealed to that revelation as the basis for their own doctrines. Already, therefore, one has evidence of the high regard in which the Apostle Paul was held by the Gnostics. In order now to more sharply define the view of Paul in the Apocalypse and in Gnosticism elsewhere, it will be necessary to examine the concept of the Twelve Apostles in the Apocalypse.

---

[506] _Ibid._

In order to properly assess the role of the Twelve Apostles in the Apocalypse one must begin with the fact that the concept of the Twelve was introduced by means of the allegorical interpretation of Gal. 2.1ff. According to the Apocalypse, it was not the revealed earthly apostles to whom Paul ascended in Gal. 2.1ff. but their hidden heavenly counterparts. The Twelve to whom Paul would ascend were "elect spirits (πνεῦμα)" (19.18-20), and this means that they were of the same nature as the "fellow spirits (πνεῦμα)" of the tenth and highest heaven (24.7-8). According to Irenaeus, the Valentinians taught that the Twelve Apostles were a type of the twelve aeons of the Pleroma which were produced by Anthropos and Ecclesia: "Duodecim Apostolos dicunt typum esse illius solius duodecim Aeonum prolationis, quam Homo cum Ecclesia protulit . . . ."[510] Similarly one reads in the Apocryphon of John:

---

[507] Ibid.

[508] Hippol. Elench., VII.26.7 (W., III, 205.10-11).

[509] Ibid.

> These are twelve aeons (αἰών) which were placed by the great son, the Autogenes (αὐτογενής), Christ (χριστός) through the will together with the divine, invisible (ἀόρατος) spirit (πνεῦμα). And (δέ) the twelve aeons (αἰών) belong to the son, the Autogenes (αὐτογενής) . . . .[511]

It is not difficult to see that the twelve aeons who were around the Aeon Christ and belonged to him were the prototypes of the Twelve Apostles of Jesus. In light of these parallels, it would appear that the twelve archtypical apostles of the Apocalypse should also be identified with the twelve aeons of the godhead who in the teaching of the Valentinians and the Apocryphon of John constituted the spiritual prototypes of the earthly apostles.

---

[510] Irenaeus, adv. Haer., II.21.1 (H., I, 324).

[511] Ap. John CG II, 8.22-26 (Giversen, 56.22-26,p.61).

If the Twelve elect and spiritual Apostles could thus be identified with the twelve aeons of the godhead, their role in the Apocalypse was two-fold. In the first place, the Twelve Apostles were seen by Paul just prior to his ascension (19.18-20), in the fourth heaven (21.1-4), and again in the Ogdoad (24.1-3), and this would suggest that the Twelve had come for Paul and accompanied him on his ascent up to the Ogdoad. In fact, if one can identify the Twelve with the fellow apostles whom Paul saw accompanying him in the fifth and sixth heavens (21.29-30; 22.14-15), the idea of an apostolic escort was practically certain. For in this case the Twelve-fellow Apostles would be found at the beginning of the ascent and in every heaven described thereafter up to the Ogdoad with the one exception of the seventh heaven.[512] Furthermore, since the Twelve Apostles were the twelve aeons of the godhead, it is highly probable that they were included in the "we" of Paul's ascent from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven (24.2-3, 6-7).[513] As the background for the concept of the Twelve escorting Apostles, one should compare the angels who came for the Gnostic soul in Ophite teaching[514] and the angels of the Good God who came for Seth and escorted him on his ascension according to the teachings of the Sethians.[515]

---

[512] See below, n.517.

[513] See above, pp. 176-77.

[514] Celsus in Origen, c.Celsum, vi.27 (K.,II,97.6-11).

If the role of the Twelve Apostles as the apostolic escort was thus derived from the concept of the angelic escort in Gnosticism, the second role of the Twelve was derived from the allegorical interpretation of Gal. 2.1ff. This was the role of those who greeted Paul in the Ogdoad. In order to clarify this role, one must recall that the little child promised Paul that the Twelve to whom he was going would greet him (19.15-18). Immediately then Paul looked up and saw the Twelve Apostles who greeted him (19.18-20). Thereafter, however, they did not greet him, although he was reported to have seen the Twelve Apostles at his right and left in the fourth heaven (21.1-4) and the fellow apostles going with him in the fifth and sixth heavens (21.29-30; 22.14-15). Only in the Ogdoad was it again reported that the Twelve Apostles greeted Paul (24.1-3). The question is, Why was the Ogdoad singled out as the one heavenly realm where the Twelve Apostles greeted Paul and thus fulfilled the promise of the little child? The answer would seem to lie in the Gnostic identification of the Ogdoad with the Heavenly Jerusalem.[516] On the basis of this identification, one could explain the greeting in the Ogdoad as the result of the allegorical interpretation of Gal. 2.1ff. For according to this interpretation Paul's ascension was to the Twelve elect and spiritual Apostles in the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Twelve greeted Paul in the Ogdoad because the Ogdoad was the Heavenly Jerusalem to which Paul ascended in Gal. 2.1ff. By thus combining the motif of the escort with the ascent to the Twelve in the Heavenly Jerusalem, the author of the Apocalypse created the rather incongruous situation in which those who had greeted Paul at the beginning and escorted him on his ascension had to stop, as it were, and greet him again in the Ogdoad.[517]

---

[515] Epiphanius, Panarion haer., 40.7 (H., II, 87.28ff.).

What is more important is the fact that although it was based in part on Gal. 2.1ff. the ascension of Paul as described in the Apocalypse exceeded the limits of that text. That is to say, Paul's ascension did not terminate in the Ogdoad-Jerusalem nor did his greeting end with the Twelve elect and spiritual Apostles. Instead, he continued on beyond the Ogdoad to the tenth and highest heaven where he greeted his "fellow spirits (πνεῦμα)" (24.7-8). Although the Twelve Apostles probably accompanied Paul on his ascent from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven, one cannot identify the fellow spirits of the tenth heaven with the Twelve Apostles. For it was made perfectly clear by the author that those whom Paul greeted above the Ogdoad were not the Twelve who were accompanying him but the inhabitants of the ninth and tenth heavens. Hence, in describing those whom Paul greeted in the ninth heaven, the author referred to them as "all those who were in the ninth heaven." (24.5-6) There were those in the ninth heaven apart from the Twelve whom Paul greeted, and unless the godhead were emptied when the Twelve went for Paul there were also those apart from the Twelve in the tenth heaven. To be sure, the Twelve Apostles were "elect spirits" and were thus of the same nature as the "fellow spirits" of the tenth heaven. They were indeed Paul's fellow apostles and fellow spirits, but they were not the only fellow spirits. Paul was greeted by the Twelve in the Ogdoad and then proceeded beyond, probably in the company of the Twelve, to the tenth and highest heaven where he greeted the rest of his fellow spirits. By greeting them, i.e. by embracing them, Paul became one not only with the Twelve but with all the aeons of the godhead.[518] In order now to understand why Paul ascended beyond the Ogdoad-Jerusalem to embrace the rest of his fellow spirits in the tenth and highest heaven, it will be necessary to examine the interpretation of Paul's apostleship in relation to the aeons of the Pleroma in Valentinian speculation.

---

[516] See above, p. 165.

[517] Could the failure of the apostolic escort in the seventh heaven be explained as the author's way of shifting from the motif of the apostolic escort to the idea of the Twelve Apostles in the Heavenly Jerusalem? On the other hand, the impression was given that the motif of the apostolic escort was dropped. For after having seen the fellow apostles in the sixth heaven, Paul reported, "the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα) led me before them" (22.15-16), and to the gatekeeper of the sixth heaven Paul said, "open to me and the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα) before me!" (22.21-23).

In refuting the Valentinian claim that the Twelve Apostles were a type of the twelve aeons of the Pleroma, Irenaeus asked of which aeon Paul was the type. Then as an afterthought he added that perhaps Paul was formed after the type of the Aeon Saviour who was constituted by the combined gifts of all the Aeons of the Pleroma: "Nisi forte in Salvatoris compositi eorum, qui et ex omnium collatione subsistit, quem at Omnia nuncupant, eo quod sit ex omnibus."[519] The Gnostic mythologumenon to which Irenaeus referred was the Perfect Aeon produced through the combined gifts of all the aeons of the

---

[518] See above, p. 176f.

[519] adv. Haer., II.21.2 (H., I, 325).

Pleroma.[520] Because he was from the whole of the Pleroma (ἀπὸ πάντων) he was called the Perfect Fruit (τέλειος καρπός).[521] This Perfect Aeon was Jesus, whom they also called Saviour, Christ, and Logos.[522] According to the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* (23), the Valentinians also called this Perfect Aeon Jesus "the Paraclete [παράκλητος] because he has come full [πλήρης] of the aeons, having come forth from the whole."[523] What is more important is that the *Excerpta* made clear what was involved in Irenaeus' allusion to the possibility that Paul was a type of the Perfect Aeon Jesus.

According to the *Excerpta*, the Aeon Christ left Sophia below and arose into the Pleroma. It was then in response to the plea of the Aeon Christ for help to be sent for the spiritual element left outside the Pleroma, i.e. the Fallen Sophia, that the Perfect Aeon Jesus was constituted and sent forth by all the aeons of the Pleroma. "Jesus was put forth by the good will of the aeons as a Paraclete [παράκλητος] for the aeon which had passed [παρελθών]."[524] Then without break, the Excerpta added: "In the type of the Paraclete, Paul became the Apostle of the Resurrection. Immediately after the Lord's Passion he also was sent to preach."[525] Just as the Aeon Christ arose into the Pleroma and the Perfect Aeon Jesus was sent forth, when Jesus arose into the Pleroma Paul was sent forth. In this one has a Heilsgeschichte, an economy of redemption, in which Paul followed Jesus as the one sent forth (i.e. as the Apostle) to redeem the spiritual element left below. Not only was it claimed that Paul was the Apostle of the Resurrection, i.e. the one sent forth after Jesus arose into the Pleroma, but he was sent forth as a type of the Perfect Aeon Jesus, the Paraclete. Paul was the second Jesus, the second redeemer! As the type of the Perfect Aeon Jesus, Paul like Jesus was constituted and sent forth as an apostle by the combined gifts of the Pleroma.

---

[520] Irenaeus, *adv*. *Haer*., I.2.6 (H., I, 23).

[521] *Ibid*.

[522] *Ibid*.

[523] *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 23.1.

In comparing the Valentinian view of Paul's apostleship with that set forth in the Apocalypse, it must first of all be recalled that the Apocalypse presupposed the Gnostic speculation on the relationship of the apostles to the aeons of the divine world. That is to say, the concept of the Twelve elect and spiritual Apostles as the heavenly prototypes of the earthly Twelve demonstrates that the author of the Apocalypse was aware of the speculation found in Valentinian teaching and the Apocryphon of John which correlated the Twelve Apostles with the twelve aeons of the Pleroma.[526] This means, therefore, that the question posed by Irenaeus and answered by the Valentinians regarding Paul's relationship to the aeons of the Pleroma was not outside the range of possibilities for the author of the Apocalypse. In fact, since the author did relate the Twelve Apostles to their heavenly counterparts, one would expect him to relate Paul to the divine world, especially since the Apocalypse dealt with Paul's apostleship as one established by an ascension to the divine world. When, therefore, the Apocalypse ends with Paul greeting, or embracing, his fellow spirits in the tenth heaven (24.7-8), one must regard these fellow spirits as those to whom Paul was related and upon whom his apostleship was grounded. By reporting that Paul not only greeted the Twelve in the Ogdoad but also all those of the ninth heaven and finally the fellow spirits of the tenth heaven, the author made it clear that Paul's apostleship did not rest only upon the authority of the heavenly Twelve but upon the authority of all the aeons of the godhead. To this extent, the view of Paul's apostleship set forth in the Apocalypse was like that of the Valentinians who taught that Paul was an apostle after the type of the Perfect Aeon Jesus in that he like Jesus was constituted and commissioned an apostle by the combined gifts of all the aeons of the Pleroma. To this one need only add that the Apocalypse itself depicted Paul as a second Christ who would descend into the world of the dead to lead captivity captive.[527]

---

[524] Excerpta, 23.2

[525] Excerpta, 23.2f: ἐν τύπῳ δὲ Παρακλήτου ὁ Παῦλος ἀναστάσεως ἀποστολὴ γέγονεν. αὐτίκα μετὰ τὸ πάθος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεστάλη κηρύσσειν.

---

[526] See above, p. 220.

Thus far the Apocalypse has been related to two aspects of the Gnostic speculation on Paul. First it was shown that the Apocalypse belonged to a current of Gnostic speculation on II Cor. 12.2-4 which extended back into the second century. Secondly, it was seen that the Apocalypse shared the exalted view of Paul's apostleship that was held by the Valentinians. At this point the perspective may be expanded by adding that the Apocalypse and the Valentinians were not alone in holding an exalted view of Paul. W. Bauer observed that "Paulus in hohem Masse die Gunst der Häretiker genossen hat."[528] In this circle which included Valentinus and Basilides, "Marcion stellt nur einen Höhepunkt dar . . . ."[529] Overagainst this high regard for Paul among the Gnostics, Bauer pointed to "die Zurückhaltung, mit der gegen die Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts hin die Männer der Kirche den Heidenapostel behandeln: Papias, Justin, Hegesipp."[530] In fact, Bauer concluded that it was in reaction to the appropriation of Paul by the heretics that the spokesmen for orthodoxy turned away from Paul and appealed instead to the Twelve Apostles.[531] By this one is brought into the final aspect of the second century Gnostic speculation on the revelation received by Paul.

---

[527] See above, p. 213.

[528] W. Bauer, _Rechtgläubigkeit_ _und_ _Ketzerei_ _im_ _ältesten_ _Christentum_ (2d.Aufl. Hrsg. von G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), p. 227.

In chapters 23-24 of his _De praescriptione haereticorum_, Tertullian, without naming the heretics involved, called attention to those who based their heretical teachings on the revelation received by Paul in his ascension vision of II Cor. 12.2-4.[532] Beyond this he also reported that those same heretics made great use of Paul and speculated on how he became an apostle while at the same time disparaging the other apostles.[533]

---

[529] _Ibid_. [530] Ibid., p. 228.

[531] _Ibid_. This view was challenged by W. Schmithals, _Das Kirchliche Apostelamt_ (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) pp. 240ff.

[532] _De prae. haer_., 23.5; 24.5-6.

[533] _Ibid_., 23.3,5.

According to these heretics, the gospel of Paul was superior to that of the other apostles, for the other apostles were "ignorant" as Paul himself realized when he rebuked Peter and those around him (Gal. 2.11ff.).[534] Against this assertion of Pauline superiority, Tertullian appealed to Gal. 2.1ff. where according to Paul's own testimony he went up to Jerusalem to counsel with Peter and the other apostles.[535] Similarly, Irenaeus had earlier reported that there were those (Marcionites?) who claimed that among the apostles only Paul knew the truth: "Solum Paulum veritatem cognovisse, cui per revelationem manifestatum est mysterium."[536] The "mystery made manifest by revelation" was that referred to by Paul in I Cor. 2.7, which Basilides and the Naassenes identified with the "inexpressible things" of II Cor. 12.4 In Irenaeus as in Tertullian one has evidence of those who asserted the superiority of Paul over the other apostles with regard to revelation, and Irenaeus, like Tertullian after him, repudiated that claim by appealing to Gal. 2.1ff. to demonstrate that Paul himself had recognized the authority of Peter and the other apostles.[537] In addition, however, one gathers from Irenaeus that the heretics were also appealing to Paul's revelation of calling (Gal. 1.11-17), for in opposing their claim of Pauline superiority Irenaeus appealed to Matt. 16.17 to prove that the Christ had also been made manifest to Peter in a divine revelation.[538] In the heretics opposed by Irenaeus and Tertullian, therefore, one sees those who in addition to speculating on Paul's vision of calling (Gal. 1.11-17) and ascension (II Cor. 12.2-4) also asserted his superiority over the other apostles and identified their teachings with the revelation received by Paul. Hence, as in the case of the Valentinians, Paul was for those heretics *the* Apostle of the Resurrection.

---

[534] Ibid., 23.1,2,5. [535] Ibid., 23.8.

[536] adv. Haer., III.13.1 (H., II,72).

[537] Ibid., III.13.3 (H., II, 73).

Finally, it would appear highly probable that those against whom the anti-Pauline polemic of the *Kerygmata Petrou* was addressed were likewise a group who asserted Paul's superiority over Peter and the other apostles with regard to revelation.[539] It was suggested at several points that the anti-Pauline polemic of the *Kerygmata* was also a pro-Petrine apology which defended Peter and the other apostles against the supporters of Pauline superiority. In the first place the Kerygmata like Tertullian defended Peter and the other apostles against those who used Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch in Gal. 2.11ff.[540] In fact, the Kerygmata, instead of attacking Paul, i.e. the supporters of Paul, exhorted them to stop opposing Peter and the other apostles and to become a "fellow-laborer" with them.[541] Secondly, it was clear from the Kerygmata that it was specifically Peter's revelation that was being called into question. For in defending himself against Paul's rebuke, Peter was made to appeal to the revelation which he had received from God in Matt. 16.17, just as Irenaeus had appealed to that same text against the supporters of Pauline superiority.[542] That the central issue was indeed the question of Pauline or Petrine superiority with regard to revelation was further substantiated by the fact that one whole section was devoted to that very question.[543] Here Matt. 16.17 was again appealed to as the revelation of the Son of God to Peter which was a true revelation overagainst the apparition which Paul reported in Gal. 1.11-17.[544] It would appear, therefore, that the anti-Pauline polemic of the Kerygmata was determined in part at least by the same pro-Pauline apology and anti-Petrine polemic opposed by Irenaeus and Tertullian.[545] Hence, in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Kerygmata Petrou one would have evidence of a group who around the end of the second century argued for Paul's superiority over the other apostles with regard to revelation.

---

[538] Ibid., III.13.2 (H., II, 73).

[539] On the anti-Pauline polemic in the *Kerygmata Petrou*, see Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, pp. 187-96. See below, n. 545.

---

[540] Clem. Hom., XVII. 19.4-6 (R., I, 240).

[541] Ibid., XVII. 19.4: τοὺς ἐκείνου ἀποστόλους φίλει, ἐμοὶ τῷ συγγεναμένῳ αὐτῷ μὴ μάχου. I9.7: καὶ μαθητὴς ἀληθείας γεγονὼς γενοῦ ἡμῖν συνεργός.

[542] Ibid., XVII. 19.6.

[543] Ibid., XVII.13.1-19.7. (R., I, 236-40).

Three aspects of the Gnostic speculation on Paul in the second century have been cited. First, with regard to the speculation on Paul's ascension vision of II Cor. 12, it was concluded that the Apocalypse of Paul participated in that speculation. Secondly, with regard to the exalted view of Paul's apostleship, it was affirmed that the Apocalypse also articulated such a view. Finally, with regard to the claim that Paul was superior to the other apostles with respect to revelation, one can only ask if the allegorical interpretation of Gal. 2.1ff. reflects an implicit devaluation of the earthly Twelve in the Apocalypse. By interpreting Gal. 2.1ff. allegorically, Paul's journey to the apostles in Jerusalem was transformed into an ascension to the Twelve elect and spiritual Apostles in the Heavenly Jerusalem. The question is, Does this interpretation represent an attempt to protect Paul against the implications of a journey to Jerusalem to counsel with the other apostles? Does it represent an attempt to eliminate the very text to which both Irenaeus and Tertullian appealed against those who supported Paul's superiority over the other apostles? All one can say is that this treatment of Gal. 2.1ff. _could_ reflect a pro-Pauline apology and an implicit anti-Twelve polemic. It may be concluded, therefore, that the Apocalypse of Paul participated in the speculation on Paul's ascension and the exalted view of his apostleship which was current among the Gnostics since the second century. Beyond this it may be said that in light of its treatment of Gal. 2.1ff. the Apocalypse _could_ have been written by just those supporters of Pauline superiority who were opposed by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and perhaps the _Kerygmata_ _Petrou_.

---

[544] *Ibid.*, XVII.18.1-19.1 (R., I, 239).

[545] Hence against Strecker's conclusion, p. 196, with regard to the author of the *Kerygmata* that "seine Polemik ist vielmehr literarisch bestimmt. . . ." See, however, Schmithals, p. 198, n. 481, who, in agreement with H. J. Schoeps, thinks that "die Rede des Petrus gegen Simon-Paulus aktuell gegen Gnostiker gerichtet sei."

CONCLUSION

As defined at the outset the purpose of this study in the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse of Paul was to determine: (1) the background of the document in the history of religions and (2) the nature and intention of the document. With regard to the history of religions problem, the results of the investigation may be summarized by listing the traditions represented and the concepts deriving from them.

Greek

1. The Erinyes as the punishing angels who punished the soul by flogging.
2. The Orphic concept of punishment by reincarnation.
3. The Orphic interrogation of the departing soul.

Iranian

1. The demon psychopomps.

Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology

1. The basic world-view.
2. The planetary deities, the telōnai of the various heavens.
3. The hour-gods who testified against the soul.

Jewish Apocalyptic

1. The ascension vision of calling.
2. The Cosmocrator who ruled from the seventh heaven.
3. The judgment scene of the fourth heaven.
4. The angels who tempted the soul to sin.

In addition to the above, the appearance of Christ in the form of a little child derived from Gnostic trinitarian speculation which may have been inspired from Egyptian religion.

Although the Apocalypse of Paul was a product of Hellenistic syncretism, its background in the history of religions was somewhat less complicated than the above survey suggested. For the Jewish Apocalyptic, which constituted the single most important source of the Apocalypse, was itself a syncretistic phenomenon. It was possible, therefore, to demonstrate that part of the mixing of traditions indicated in the survey was already accomplished in Jewish Apocalyptic from which it was derived by the Apocalypse of Paul. To begin with, the figure of the demon psychopomps from the Iranian religion had already been adopted by Jewish Apocalyptic and could have been derived directly there from by the Apocalypse. What is more important is that the world-view of Babylonian-Hellenistic astrology had also already been taken over by Jewish Apocalyptic. This was the view which conceived of the earth as surrounded by the seven concentric planetary spheres and the whole encompassed by an eighth sphere, the realm of the fixed stars. It was this world-view which constituted the starting point for the world-view set forth in the Apocalypse, and the fact that it located the Jewish God in the seventh heaven as the Cosmocrator indicated that the Apocalypse assumed the astrological world-view specifically as articulated by Jewish Apocalyptic which also located God in the seventh heaven.

Apart from the Orphic concepts of reincarnation and the interrogation of the departing soul, only the demonology of the Apocalypse was left with influences which were not derived from Jewish Apocalyptic. These were the Erinyes from the Greek tradition and the planetary deities and the hour-gods from astrology. Even with respect to demonology, however, the influence of Jewish Apocalyptic was dominant. To begin with, the Cosmocrator was the Hebrew God, and the fallen angels of Jewish Apocalyptic were the tempting angels of the Apocalypse. Indeed, when at two points the Apocalypse referred to the cosmic powers, the categories of Jewish Apocalyptic were employed. At 19.3-7 the cosmic powers were referred to as the ἄρχοντες, ἐξουσίαι, ἀρχάγγελοι, δυνάμεις (60M), and δαίμονες . At 23.21-22 they were called the ἀρχαί and the ἐξουσίαι . As a comparison with I En. 61.10, T. Levi 3.8, and II En. 20.1 would demonstrate, these were the categories of Jewish Apocalyptic. It may be concluded, therefore, that whereas the Apocalypse of Paul was a product of Hellenistic syncretism, the primary background of the Apocalypse was supplied by Jewish Apocalyptic with added influences from the Greek tradition and astrology.

If the conceptuality of the Apocalypse was syncretistic, that which was new and distinctive which served as the catalysis reinterpreting and integrating the diverse elements was the radical Gnostic dualism. Assuming the eight-fold cosmography of astrology as articulated by Jewish Apocalyptic, the Apocalypse of Paul radically transformed that cosmography by adding two higher heavens. For in this manner the highest spiritual realm was located beyond and outside of the visible cosmos, while the latter was relegated to the realm of the demonic, ruled over by the Hebrew God from the seventh heaven. In this, one has the Gnostic transcendental theology and cosmic pessimism. Following this basic repudiation of the cosmos and cosmocrator, the ascension became an ascent through the demonized planetary spheres, and the judgment of the dead was subsumed under the authority of the demonized cosmic deities. In the Apocalypse of Paul one has, therefore, an instance in which the concepts of Jewish Apocalyptic, and to a lesser extent those of Greek religion and Hellenistic astrology, were subjected to the Gnostic reinterpretation.

With regard to the nature and intention of the document, it has been demonstrated that the Apocalypse of Paul was an ascension vision of calling. By combining Gal. 1.11-17 and II Cor. 12.2-4, it interpreted Paul's vision of calling as an ascension to the highest heaven from whence he was sent forth again into the world as an apostle. Because it was an ascension vision of calling, the Apocalypse gave only minor attention to the description of the various heavens. Apart from the scenes of the fourth and fifth heavens, the description of the heavens was made to serve the central theme of Paul's ascension vision of calling.

The primary intention of the Apocalypse was to promulgate an exalted view of Paul's apostleship. It affirmed that Paul's apostleship was one which was grounded in an ascension to the highest heaven and constituted by the full body of the godhead. Like the Valentinians, it expressed the view that Paul was the second Christ and redeemer. In fact, the Apocalypse of Paul narrated the Apostle's vision of calling which could have served as the literary basis for the Valentinian claim that Paul was the Apostle of the Resurrection after the type of Jesus, the Perfect Fruit of the Pleroma. The Nag Hammadi Apocalypse of Paul was important, therefore, because it provided for the first time the documentation for the Apostle's vision of calling which expressed the views of those Gnostics for whom Paul was the Apostle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LEXICA AND GRAMMARS

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 4th ed. revised. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907, 1959.

Crum, W. E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

Goodwin, William W., and Charles B. Gulick. *Greek Grammar*. New York: Blaisdell, 1958.

Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961-.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. revised by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Steindorff, Georg. *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Till, Walter C. *Koptische Grammatik (saïdischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen*. 2. Aufl. (Lehrbücher für das Studium der orientalischen Sprachen, Band I) Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961.

CLASSICAL SOURCES

Aeschyli septem qvae svpersvnt tragoediae. Recensvit Gilbertvs Mvrray. Editio altera. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1955.

Aristophanis comoediae. Recognovervnt breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxervnt F.W. Hall et W.M. Geldart. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, n.d.

Aristotelis de caelo libri qvattvor. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit D.J. Allan. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1936, reprinted with corrections 1961.

Βερδελῆ, Νικολάου Μ. "ΚΑΛΚΗ ΤΕΦΡΟΔΟΧΟΣ ΕΚ ΦΑΡΣΑΛΩΝ," *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ* (1950-51), 80-105.

M. Tvlii Ciceronis scripta qvae manservnt omnia. Recognovit C.F.W. Mveller et Reinholdvs Klotz. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1889-1902.

Demosthenes orationes. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit S.H. Bvtcher et W. Rennie. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1903-31.

Diels, Hermann. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 5. Aufl. by W. Kranz. Berlin: Weidmann, 1934-38.

Διοδωρου βιβλιοθηκη ἱστορικη . *Diodori bibliotheca historica*. Editionem primam cvravit IMM. Bekker, alteram Lvdovicvs Dindorf, Recognovit Fridericvs Vogel. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1888-1906.

Evripidis fabvlae. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit Gilbertvs Mvrray. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis). Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1902.

Gaertringen, Hiller von, and C. Robert. "Relief von dem Grabmal eines rhodischen Schulmeisters," *Hermes*, XXXVII (1902), 121ff.

Herodoti historiae. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit C. Hude (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1927.

Hesiodi Carmina. Recensvit Aloisivs Rzach. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Stvtgardiae: In aedibvs B.G. Tevbneri, 1965.

Homeri opera. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit Thomas W. Allen Editio altera. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1917.

Iamblichvs de vita pythagorica liber. Edidit Lvdovicvs Devbner. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B.G. Tevbneri, 1937.

Inscriptiones Attica Evclidis anno anteriores. Edidit Fridericvs Hiller de Gaertringen. Berolini: G. de Grvyter, 1924.

Kern, Otto. *Orphicorum fragmenta*. Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1922.

Luciani Samosatensis opera. Ex recognitione Caroli Jacobitz. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1913.

Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii commentarii in Somnivm Scipionis. Edidit Iacobvs Willis (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1963.

Murray, Gilbert. "Critical Appendix on the Orphic Tablets," in Jane Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. Reprint of 3d ed. of Cambridge University Press, 1922. New York: Meridian Books, 1960, pp. 659-73.

Nauck, A. (ed.). *Tragicorvm graecorvm fragmenta*. Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1889.

Olivieri, A. *Lamellae aureae Orphicae* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 133) Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1915.

Pavsanias graeciae descriptio. Recensvit Fridericvs Spiro. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Stvtgardiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1964.

Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis Meteorologicorvm librvm primvm commentarivm. Edidit M. Haydvck. (*Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*, XIV: 1) Berlin: Societas Regia Scientiarvm, 1882ff.

Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit C. M. Bowra. Editio altera. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1961.

Platonis opera. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit Ioannes Burnet. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1900-1907.

Macci Plavti comoediae. Recognovit breviqve adnotatione critica instrvxit W. M. Lindsey. (Scriptorvm classicorvm bibliotheca oxoniensis) Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1904, 1905.

Plutarchus moralia. Edidit G. N. Bernardakis. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1888-96.

Procli Diadochi in Platonis Rem pvblicam commentarii. Edidit Gvilelmvs Kroll. (Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm tevbneriana) Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1894-1901.

Servii Grammatici qvi fervntvr in Vergilii carmina commentarii. Recensvervnt G. Thilo et H. Hagen. Lipsiae: In aedibvs B. G. Tevbneri, 1881-1902.

Simplicii in Aristotelis De Caelo commentaria. Edidit I. L. Heiberg (*Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*, VII) Berlin: Societas Regia Scientiarvm, 1882ff.

P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI. Edited by E. Norden. 4. Aufl. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1957.

EGYPTIAN SOURCES

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Book of the Dead*. *The Chapters of Coming forth by Day*. *An English Translation with Introduction, Notes, Etc*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1898.

Mercer, Samuel A. B. The Pyramid Texts in Translation and Commentary. New York: Longmans, Green, 1952.

Prichard, James B. (ed.). Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. 2d. ed. revised. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

GNOSTIC AND RELATED SOURCES

Primary Sources

Allberry, C.R.C. A Manichaean Psalm-Book. (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, Vol. II) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938.

Böhlig, Alexander, and Pahor Labib. Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo. Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Sonderband (1963).

_______. Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Institut für Orientforschung, Nr. 58) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

Casey, Robert Pierce. The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria. (Studies and Documents, Vol. I) London: Christophers, 1934.

Dieterich, A. Eine Mithrasliturgie. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910.

Drower, E. S. The Thousand and Twelve Questions (Alf trisar Šuialia). (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Nr. 32) Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.

_______. The Haran Gawaita and the Baptism of Hibil-Ziwa. (Studie Testi, Vol. 176) Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953).

_______. The Canonical Prayerbook of the Mandaeans. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

Giversen, Søren. *Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. (Acta Theologica Danica, Vol. V) Copenhagen: Prostant apud Munksgaard, 1963.

Grant, Robert M. *Gnosticism. A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.

Guillaumont, A., H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and Yassah Abd Al Masih, *The Gospel According to Thomas. Coptic Text Established and Translated*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Harris, J. Rendal. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. Published from the Syriac Version*. 2d ed. revised. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.

Hennecke, Edgar, and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. 3. Aufl. 2 Vol. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959, 1964. Eng. trans. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Ed. R. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Horner, George. *Pistis Sophia, Literally Translated from the Coptic*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924.

Jackson, A. V. Williams. *Researches in Manichaeism: With Special Reference to the Turfan Fragments*. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. XIII) New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

James, Montague Rhodes. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Krause, Martin, and Pahor Labib. *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*. (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archaologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band 1) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962.

Kroll, W. *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. (Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, VII:1) Breslau, 1894; Reprinted, Hildesheim: Olms, 1962.

Lidzbarski, Mark. *Ginza*. *Der Schatz oder Das grosse Buch der Mandäer*. (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte, Band 13, Gruppe 4) Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925.

______. *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*. Giessen: Topelmann, 1915.

______. *Mandäische Liturgien*. (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, neue Folge Band XVII, 1) Berlin: 1920; Reprinted Berlin: Weidmann, 1962.

Lipsius, R. A., and M. Bonnet. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Reprint of the Leipzig edition of 1891-1903. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.

Malinine, Michel, Henri-Charles Puech and Gilles Quispel. *Evangelium Veritatis*. Zürich: Rascher, 1956.

Mead, G.R.S. *Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany: Being for the most part Extracts from the Books of the Saviour, to which are Added Excerpts from a Cognate Literature*. 2d ed. revised. London: Watkins, 1921, reprinted 1963.

Poimandres. Edited by A. D. Nock and translated by A. -J. Festugière. (*Corpvs Hermeticvm*. Tome I: Traites I-XII. 2d ed.) Paris: Societé d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1960.

Polotsky, H. J., and A. Böhlig. *Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin*. Band I: *Kephalaia*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940.

Rehm, Bernhard. *Die Pseudoklementinen*. Band I: *Homilien*. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Band 42) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953.

Till, Walter C. *Das Evangelium nach Philippos*. (Patristische Texte und Studien, Band 2) Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963.

_______. *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*. Erster Band: *Die Pistis Sophia, Die beiden Bucher des Jeû, Unbekanntes altgnostisches werk*. 3. Aufl. (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* der ersten Jahrhunderte, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, erster Band) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

_______. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 60. Band = V. Reihe, Band 5) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955.

Wilson, R. McL. *The Gospel of Philip*. *Translated from the Coptic text with an Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Secondary Sources

Cumont, Franz, and M. A. Kugener. *Recherches sur le Manicheisme*. I: *La Cosmogoni manicheenne d'après Theodore bar Khôn*. Bruxelles, 1908.

Epiphanius. *Ancoratus und Panarion*. Edited by Karl Holl. 2 vols. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Bände 25, 31) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915, 1922.

Hippolytus Werke. Dritter Band: *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Edited by Paul Wendland. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Band 26) Leipzig: Hinrich, 1916.

Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque adversus Haereses. Edidit W. Wigan Harvey. Catabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857. Republished at Ridgewood, New Jersey: Gregg Press, 1965.

Origen *Contra Celsum*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.

Origenes Werke. 2 Bd: *Buch V-VIII Gegen Celsus*. *Die Schrift vom Gebet*. Edited by Paul Koetschau. 4 Bd.: *Der Johanneskommentar*. Edited by Erwin Preuschen. (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Bande 3, 10). Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899.

Qvinti Septimi Florentis Tertvlliani Opera. Pars I. *Opera Catholica advervs Marcionem.* (Corpvs Christianorvm Series Latina) Tvrnholti: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1954.

Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* in H. Pognon. *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir.* Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1898.

Völker, Walther. *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis.* (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen - und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, n. F. 5) Tübingen: Mohr, 1932.

IRANIAN SOURCES

Darmesteter, J. *The Zend-Avesta.* (The Sacred Books of the East, American ed. Vol. III) New York: Christian Literature Company, 1898.

Duchesne-Guillemin, J. *Zoroastre: Étude critique avec une traduction commentée des Gàthà.* (Les dieux et les hommes, Vol. II) Paris: Maisonneuve, 1948).

West, E. W. *Pahlavi Texts.* Parts I-II. (The Sacred Books of the East, Vols. V, XVIII) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1880, 1882.

Zaehner, R. C. *The Teachings of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs.* (Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West, No. 14) London: Allen & Unwin, 1956.

_______. *Zurvan, A Zoroastrian Dilemma.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN SOURCES

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Biblia Hebraica. Edidit Rud. Kittel et P. Kahle. Editionem tertiam denuo elaboratam ad finem perduxerunt editonem septimam auxerunt et emendaverunt A. Alt et O. Eissfeldt. Editio duodecima emendata typis editionis septimae expressa. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, n.d.

Burrows, Millar, John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee. *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, fascicle 2)

Charles, R. H. *The Ascension of Isaiah: Translated from the Ethopic Version, which, together with the new Greek Fragment, the Latin Versions and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, is here Published in Full*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

_______. *The Book of Enoch Translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethopic Text Emended and Revised in accordance with hitherto Uncollated Ethiopic Mss. and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin Fragments which are here published in Full*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.

_______. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Edited from Nine Mss, together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments*. Oxford: 1908; Reprinted, Hildesheim: Olms, 1960.

_______. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. Vol. II: *Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford: 1913; Reprinted, Oxford: Clarenton Press, 1963.

Firmicus Maternus, Julius. *De errore profanarum religionum*. Edited by Konrad Zieglek. München: Hueber, 1953.

Gaster, Moses. "The Apocalypse of Abraham," *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, IX:1 (1887), 1-32.

_______. *Studies and Texts*. London: Maggs Bros., 1925-28.

Hennecke, Edgar and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher übersetzung*. 3. Aufl. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959, 1964. Eng. trans. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Ed. R. Wilson Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

James, Montague Rhodes. *Apocrypha Anecdota*. 2 Series. (Texts and Studies, II:3, V:1) Cambridge: University Press, 1893, 1897.

_______. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

_______. *The Testament of Abraham*. (Texts and Studies, Vol. II No. 2) Cambridge: University Press, 1892.

Kautzsch, E. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. 2 vols. Tübingen: 1900; Reprinted, Hildesheim: Olms, 1962.

Morfill, W. R., and R. H. Charles. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.

Novum Testamentum Graece. *Cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle novis curis elaboraverunt Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland*. Editio vicesima quinta. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Rabin, C. *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Riessler, Paul. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*. 2. Aufl. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.

Septuaginta. *Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX Interpretes*. Edidit Alfred Rahlfs. Editio sexta. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, n.d.

Tischendorf, C. von. *Apocalypses Apocryphae*. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1866.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

Bauer, W. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 10) 2 Aufl. Hrsg. von G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.

Betz, H. D. *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 76 Band = V. Reihe, Band 21) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.

_______. "Zum Problem des religionsgeschichtliche Verständnisse der Apokalyptik," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 63 (1966), 391-409.

Boll, Franz. *ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ* I: *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis: Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914.

Boll, Franz, and Carl Bezold. *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung: Die Geschichte und das Wesen der Astrologie*. 2d ed. revised by W. Gundel. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.

Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in Magical Amulets*. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XLIX) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.

Bonnet, H. *Reallexikon der Ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952.

Bousset, W. "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, III-IV (1900-1901), 136-69, 229-73. Reprinted. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

_______. *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. 21) 3. Aufl. Tübingen: Mohr, 1926.

Breasted, James H. *The Dawn of Conscience*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *Amulets and Talismans*. Reprint of edition entitled *Amulets and Superstitions*. New York: University Books, 1961.

Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Burkert, W. *Weisheit und Wissenschaft: Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaus und Platon* (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach und Kunstwissenschaft, Bd. X) Nürnberg: Carl, 1962.

Casey, R. "The Apocalypse of Paul," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXIV (January, 1933), 1-32.

Charles, R. H. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. 2d ed. Revised. London: Black, 1913.

Conzelmann, H. *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament) Tübingen: Mohr, 1963.

Cumont, Franz. *After Life in Roman Paganism*. 1922; Reprinted, New York: Dover, 1959.

_______. *Lux Perpetua*. Paris: Geuthner, 1949.

_______. *The Mysteries of Mithra*. Translated by T. J. McCormack from the 2d French ed. revised. New York: Dover, 1956.

Daniélou, Jean. Review of *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, by A. Böhlig and P. Labib, *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, LIV (1966), 285-88.

Dieterich, Albrecht. *Nekyia: Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse*. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

Doresse, Jean. *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics: An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts Discovered at Chenoboskion with an English Translation and Critical Evaluation of The Gospel According to Thomas*. Translated by Philip Mairet. New York: Viking Press, 1960.

Drower, E. S. *The Mandeans of Iraq and Iran*. Leiden: Brill, 1962.

_______. *The Secret Adam: A Study of Nasoraean Gnosis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Eliade, Mircea. *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*. Translated by W. R. Trask (Bollingen Series, LXXXVI) New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1964.

Festugière, A. J. *La Revelation d'Hermes Trismegiste*. (Librairie Lecoffre) Paris: Gabalda, 1953.

Gardiner, A. H. *The Attitude of the Ancient Egyptians to Death and the Dead*. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

Gaster, Moses. "Samaritan Phylacteries and Amulets," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (March, May, June, 1915), 96-107, 135-44, 163-74, and (Feb., 1916), 70ff. Reprinted in his Studies and Texts, I, 387-482.

_______. *Studies and Texts*. London: Maggs Bros., 1925-28.

Gildersleeve, Basil L. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: 1890; Reprinted, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965.

Gressmann, H. *Der Ursprung der israelitischen-jüdischen Eschatologie*. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905.

Gundel, W. "Γαλαξίας," *Paulys Realencyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung Hrsg. von Georg Wissowa u. al. Stuttgart: 1893ff., Vol. VII,1, cols. 560-71.

Guthrie, W.K.C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement*. (Methuen's Handbooks of Archaeology) 2d ed. revised. London: Methuen, 1952.

Haenchen, E. *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentor über das Neue Testament) 12 Aufl. Göttingen: Vondenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

Harrison, Jane. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. 3d ed. revised. Cambridge; Reprinted, New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

Hübschmann, H. "Die parsische Lehre vom Jenseits und jüngsten Gericht," *Jahrbücher fur protestantische* Theologie, V (1879), 203-45.

Hyatt, J. P. "Introduction and Exegesis to The Book of Jeremiah," *The Interpreter's Bible*, V, 777-1142.

Jackson, A. V. Williams. *Zoroastrian Studies: The Iranian Religion and Various Monographs*. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. XII) New York: Columbia University Press, 1928.

Jonas, Hans. *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist I*. 3.Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

______. *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

Kasser, R. "Textes Gnostiques: Remarques à propos des éditions recentes du Livre Secret de Jean et des Apocalypses de Paul, Jacques et Adam," *Le Muséon*, LXXVIII: 1-2 (1965), 71-98.

______. "Textes Gnostiques: Nouvelles remarques à propos des Apocalypses de Paul, Jacques et Adam," *Le Muséon*, LXXVIII: 1-2 (1965), 299-306.

Kees, Hermann. *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter: Grundlagen und Entwicklung bis zum Ende des mittleren Reiches*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926.

Kohler, K. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggadah," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, VII (1895), 581-606.

Kramer, S. N. "The Oldest Literary Catalogue," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 88 (Dec., 1942), 10-19.

Krause, Martin. "Der koptische Handschriftenfund bei Nag Hammadi: Umfang und Inhalt," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo*, XVIII (1962), 121-32.

Kroll, W. "Die chaldäischen Orakel," *Rheinisches Museum*, n.F. (1895), 636-40. Reprinted in Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. Reprint of the 1st ed. of *Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen*, VII.1 in Breslau, 1894. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962, pp. 79-83.

Leisegang, H. "Plato," *Paulys Realencyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung Hrsg. von Georg Wissowa u. al. Stuttgart: 1893ff. Vol. XX,2, cols. 2342-2537.

Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 2. Aufl. 2 vols. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, V. 2.1-2) München: Beck, 1955,61.

Nyberg, H. S. *Die Religionen des alten Iran*. Translated by H. H. Schaeder. (Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-aegyptischen Gesellschaft [E.V.], 43. Band) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1938.

Pavry, J.D.C. *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life: From Death to the Individual Judgment*. 2d.ed. revised. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. XI) New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "Les nouveaux Écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (Premier inventaire et essai d'identification)," *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*. Boston: Byzantine Institute, 1950, pp. 91-143.

_______. "Decouverte d'une bibliothèque gnostique en Haute-Égypte," *Encyclopedie Francaise*, *fasc.* 19.42, 4-13.

_______. *Le Manicheisme*. (Musée Guimet bibliothèque de diffusion, Vol. LVI) Paris: Civilisations de Sud, 1949.

Quispel, G. "W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1955," *Vigiliae Christianae*, X (1956), 51-52.

Radermacher, L. *Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen*. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1903.

Rohde, Erwin. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. Translated by W. B. Hillis. From the 8th German ed. (International Library of Psychology Philosophy and Scientific Method) London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1925.

Rudolph, Kurt. "Böhlig, Alexander u. Pahor Labib: *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi*," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, XC (1965), cols. 359-62.

_______. *Die Mandäer*. 2 vols. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.F. 56,57) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960,61.

Rühl, L. *De mortvorvm ivdicio*. Nvmbvrgi ad Salam: Typis Lipperti et sociorvm, 1903. Reprinted (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, Vol. II.2) Giessen: 1903.

Russel, D. S. *The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (The Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. 4.Aufl. Dusseldorf: Patmos, 1963.

_______. *Der Brief an die Galäter*. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar uber das Neue Testament, Abt. 7) 12.Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Schmithals, W. *Das Kirchliche Apostelamt*. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.F.61) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Schweizer, E. *EGO EIMI...: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.F. 38) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

Silverstein, Th. *Visio sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with Nine Texts*. (Studies and Documents, Vol. IV) London: Christophers, 1935.

Söderblom, N. *La Vie future d'après le mazdéisme à la lumière des croyances parallèles dans les autres religions: étude d'eschatologie comparée*. (Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, Vol. IX) Paris: 1901.

Spiegel, Joachim. *Die Idee vom Totengericht in der ägyptischen Religion*. (Leipziger ägyptologische Studien, Heft 2) Gluckstadt: Augustin, 1935.

Strecker, Georg. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 70 Band = V. Reihe, Band 15) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.

Unnik, W. C. Van. *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*. Frankfurt a.M.: Scheffler, 1960.

Voltz, P. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. 2.Aufl. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.

Wendland, P. Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. I.2) Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.

Widengren, Geo. King and Saviour. Vol. III: The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book. (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1950:7) Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1950.

_______. Mani und der Manichäismus. (Urban-Bücher: Die wissenschaftliche Taschenbuchreihe, Nr. 57) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961.

_______. "Stand und Aufgaben der iranischen Religionsgeschichte," Numen, I-II (1954-55), 16-83, 47-134. Reprinted Leiden: Brill, 1955.

Zandee, J. Death as an Enemy: According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions (Studies in the History of Religions, Supplements to Numen, Vol. V) Leiden: Brill, 1960.